



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2025 by R Parker BSc (Hons)

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/25/3359880

62 Courtenay Road, Woking, Surrey GU21 5HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Hassan Hussain against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2024/0751.
 - The development proposed is described as 'rear two storey extension on existing single storey. Materials to match existing (Windows, bricks and roof).'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is in a residential area predominantly characterised by dwellings grouped by era and repeated design. These groupings give the area a stylistic harmony, punctuated by gaps between and behind buildings which contribute to a sense of appropriate density. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling house set within a prominent corner plot, which has already been significantly extended to the side and rear. The increased massing to the side and rear is particularly evident when viewed from Delta Road.
5. Combined with previous additions, the proposal would result in a substantial and disproportionate increase in bulk and depth, at odds with the character of the host property and the prevailing pattern of development within the wider area. As a result of the proposal, the extended property would not fit comfortably within its plot and appear unduly prominent and dominant within the street scene, which would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. I recognise that the current proposal constitutes alterations to a previous scheme dismissed on appeal (APP/A3655/D/23/3333726). The depth of the proposed extension has been increased, whilst its width and ridge height have been marginally reduced. Whilst the addition of architectural detailing features in the form

of windows would to some degree assist with breaking up the visual impact of the extension, it would not mask the excessive bulk, massing and height resulting from the proposal. Thus, the changes to the previous appeal scheme have done little to address the concerns raised by the Inspector.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to some nearby examples of properties which have been extended and similarly to the appeal site, occupy corner plots. I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to the construction of these extensions, and cannot be certain that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, notably in respect of development plan policy. That said, the additions at 181 Boundary Road and 60 Courtenay Road appear to be of a lesser scale and depth than the proposal, particularly at first floor level. The property at 183 Boundary Road has been extended significantly, and does not positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area, by reason of its excessive scale and should, therefore, not be viewed as an example to be emulated.
8. The bulk and massing of the proposed extension and its undue prominence when viewed from Delta Road would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policy CS21 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), the Woking Design Supplementary Planning Document (2015), and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively, these seek well-designed development which makes a positive contribution to its surrounding area, including with regard to scale, proportion and layout.
9. The Woking Borough Council Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight Supplementary Planning Document (2022) relates to development affecting living conditions, which have not been identified as a main issue in this case. Therefore, the appeal proposal does not conflict with this document.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the objection raised by a neighbouring resident regarding the impact that the proposal would have on their living conditions. This was addressed as part of the previous appeal for a similar proposal, where the Inspector found that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. There are no reasons for me to reach an alternative view in respect of the current proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Parker

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards INSPECTOR