



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/25/3364413

146 Goldsworth Road, Woking, Surrey GU21 6NE

- 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 Mr & Mrs Waseem and Nabeela Ahmed and Rasheed against the decision of the Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2025/0017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2 storey rear extension, the erection of an infill porch to the front and proposed roof enlargement with 1m increase in ridge height with 6No roof lights and landscaping and driveway modifications to the front to create 3 parking spaces.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed 2 storey rear extension and proposed roof enlargement with 1m increase in ridge height with 6No roof lights.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates the infill porch and landscaping and driveway modifications, and planning permission is granted for the erection of an infill porch to the front and landscaping and driveway modifications to the front to create 3 parking spaces at 146 Goldsworth Road, Woking, Surrey GU21 6NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PLAN/2025/0017 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site and Block Plan – 2406-146GR-001 Rev A3; Parking and Street Scene – 2406-146GR-002 Rev A3; Existing and Proposed Front Elevations - 2406-146GR-004 Rev A3; Existing and Proposed Rear Elevations - 2406-146GR-005 Rev A3; Existing and Proposed Side 2 Elevations - 2406-146GR-007 Rev A3; Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans - 2406-146GR-008 Rev A3; Existing and Proposed First Floor Plans - 2406-146GR-009 Rev A3; 3D Views - 2406-146GR-012 Rev A3; and Existing and Proposed Sections - 2406-146GR-013 Rev A3
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the hereby approved development, excluding the area of hardstanding, shall match that of the existing built form.
 - 4) No above ground level works associated with the hereby approved creation of front hardstanding and associated hard and soft landscaping including

retaining wall shall be carried out until details of the retaining wall, including levels and visibility splay shall be provided to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the proposed development shall be carried out and be retained in accordance with the approved details.

- 5) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the hereby approved parking spaces have been laid out in accordance with the approved plans. Thereafter the parking area shall be retained for the designated purpose.
- 6) The new hardstanding hereby permitted shall be made of porous materials, or alternatively provision shall be otherwise made to direct run-off water from the new hardstanding hereby permitted to a permeable or porous area or surface within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse.
- 7) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the dwelling is provided with an Electric Vehicle charging point in accordance with a scheme to be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the proposed development shall be carried out and be retained in accordance with the approved details

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development to the front of the property on (i) the character and appearance of the host property and area in general; (ii) the living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties; and (iii) highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The site is located within a predominantly residential area; the appeal property is a two-storey detached property which sits at a higher ground level to the highway. The property benefits from off street parking to the rear of the property accessed via a drive between the property and No. 144 Goldsworth Road.
5. In relation to the proposed infill porch the Council confirm that by reason of its subordinate scale and design this element of the works would appear sympathetic to the host property, I agree.
6. The proposed rear extension would project across the width of the property extending 6m at ground floor and 4m at first floor. The extension would follow the building line of the side of the property. Whilst the Council contend that a 1m gap should be provided between No. 148 and the appeal property this would look odd in the context of the existing built form.
7. The proposed increase in roof height by 1m would retain the front most gable with dual pitched roof with side gables the design would be sympathetic to the existing property. Cumulatively the proposed extensions and works would result in a substantial property; however the resulting development would not be incongruous to the host property or surrounding area.
8. In relation to the works to create the area of hardstanding to the front of the property I observed during my site visit that many of properties in the area have hardstanding to the front, which form part of the character and appearance of the

area. The difference in level between the highway and property would require the excavation of material from the site and provision of retaining walls, the submitted plans, whilst limited in detail, show the proposed level of the drive which slopes down from the existing property towards the highway. This sloped area of hardstanding, excavation of material and provision of retaining walls would not be out of keeping with the immediate area.

9. My attention has been drawn to an allowed appeal¹ at No. 148 Goldsworth Road I note that the description of development does not include the provision of hardstanding to the front, however I note that the Inspector references *other alterations proposed such as the modifications to the driveway would not be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area*. Notwithstanding this I have not been provided with any evidence to assess the scheme against the proposal before me.
10. Nevertheless, I find that the works to create front hardstanding, with associated hard and soft landscaping including retaining walls would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.
11. In relation to this main issue relating to character and appearance of the area, there is no conflict with Policy CS21 of the Woking Local Development Document, Woking Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy) which seeks amongst other things for developments to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.
12. There is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design, appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.
13. The proposed development would not conflict with the Woking Design SPD (2015) (the Design SPD) which provides design guidance and good practice to improve the quality of design in new development across the borough.

Living Conditions

14. The proposed two storey rear extension projects 4m from the rear two storey elevation of the appeal property, the proposed single storey extension projects a further 2m. The neighbouring property No. 148 Goldsworth Road is slightly set back on the plot compared to the appeal property. There is a small gap between properties, approximately 0.3m.
15. The Design SPD confirms that *two storey extensions, particularly if they extend beyond 3 metres from the building, need to be carefully sited as they can result in loss of daylight or have an overbearing impact on the adjoining dwelling unless they are kept well away from the separating boundary*.
16. There is disagreement between parties as to whether the proposed development would comply with the 45-degree angle when measured from the centre point of the nearest bedroom window contained within the rear elevation of No. 148. Nevertheless, the appellants own plan does show that the 45 degree angle is encroached upon by the development. I understand that No. 148 has approval² for extension/alteration, I have not been provided with substantive details relating to

¹ APP/A3655/D/23/3331607

² PLAN/2023/0982

these works nevertheless at the time of my site visit I did not observe any recent or current works to No. 148.

17. Whilst the overall design of the proposed development would be acceptable, the bulk of the extension along with the height of the pitched roof would be detriment of the occupiers of No. 148. There are examples of staggers between two storey properties within the area, namely No's 142 and 144, nevertheless in its current form the proposed two storey development would be dominant to the occupiers of No. 148.
18. The proposed development includes new windows to the front, sides and rear as well as rooflights. The windows facing the front and rear would be similar to the views currently afforded to the property. First floor side windows are proposed to face No. 148, these would serve en-suites as such a planning condition could be imposed to secure obscure glazing to mitigate any overlooking. A ground floor window and door are proposed to face No. 144. Due to the lack of boundary treatment the proposed new additions would provide direct views of the neighbouring private amenity space. Notwithstanding this these would be secondary as such they could be obscurely glazed which could be secure through the imposition of a planning condition.
19. The proposal includes rooflights serving a bedroom which would face towards No's. 144 and 148. These have the potential to cause direct overlooking of private amenity space beyond what is currently experienced. As these are the only windows proposed for the bedroom they should not be obscured. I find that these rooflights would create overlooking and loss of privacy to the occupants of neighbouring properties. Whilst the appellant suggests these could be replaced by rooflight in the rear roof slope, I do not have details of this before me to assess.
20. Notwithstanding this the proposed infill porch and landscaping and driveway modifications to the front would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
21. In relation to this main issue relating to the effect on living conditions of occupants of neighbouring properties, the proposed two storey rear extension and rooflights as outlined above is contrary to Policy CS21 of the Core Strategy, which seeks to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and avoid significant harmful impacts.
22. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks to protect the amenity for existing and future users.
23. There is conflict with the Design SPD and the Woking Borough Council, Location Development Document, Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight Supplementary Planning Document (2022) in so far as they relate to the protection of the living conditions of neighbouring properties.

Highways Safety

24. The Council confirm that the proposed off-street parking for 3 vehicles would be acceptable for the appeal site, despite the size of the parking spaces falling marginally short of the minimum requirements. I agree.

25. The County Highway Authority have not objected to the proposed development, however, have recommend conditions are attached to any approval. The proposed conditions relate to layout of the parking spaces, the installation of a Electric Vehicles charging point and visibility zones. The Council consider that ensuring the layout is in accordance with the approved plans and the provision of an EV charging point can be controlled via the imposition of planning conditions I agree.
26. The Council advance that in relation to the provision of visibility zones these should be kept permanently clear of any obstruction over 1.05m high, a plan/details have not been provided by the appellant to demonstrate this. Nevertheless, I observed during my site visit that low walls exist along the front of many properties with off-street parking. The proposal would remove the existing wall fronting the appeal site however the wall to No. 148 would remain. The provision of parking spaces adjacent the existing wall at No. 148 would be similar to other properties in the area. Notwithstanding this due to the proposed creation of retaining walls a condition controlling the final detail of these could be imposed to ensure visibility was not restricted.
27. I am mindful that the Framework confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios. Given the proposal is similar to existing off-street parking in the area, and the lack of objection from the County Highway Authority I have not been provided with substantive evidence to confirm that the proposed development would result in unacceptable impact on highway safety or that the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.
28. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm highway safety. In relation to this main issue there is no conflict with Policy CS21 the Core Strategy and the Framework which seek amongst other things for developments to encourage sustainable means of travel and have an acceptable impact on highway safety.

Conclusion

29. For the reasons given above, I find the proposed erection of an infill porch to the front and landscaping and driveway modifications to the front to create 3 parking spaces are clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed 2 storey rear extension and roof enlargement with 1m increase in ridge height with 6No roof lights. I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the infill porch to the front and landscaping and driveway modifications. However, in relation to the proposed 2 storey rear extension and roof enlargement with 1m increase in ridge height with 6No roof lights, the appeal should be dismissed.
30. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and conditions specifying the relevant plans and parking layout as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area and the carriageway from potential water run-off I have imposed conditions concerning materials.
31. I have attached a condition relating to details for the retaining wall, levels and visibility splay in the interests of highway safety.

32. I have imposed a condition relating to the provision of an Electric Vehicle charging point, whilst the Council suggests specifications for the minimum requirement, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to support this requirement.
33. The Council have suggested a condition relating to the submission of a landscaping scheme however I am not persuaded that this is necessary based on the proposed development and the surrounding context.
34. A condition relating to pedestrian inter-visibility splay has been proposed by the Council, however I have not been provided with substantive evidence that supports its inclusion. Whilst the appellant confirms this condition was attached to the approved development at No. 148, I have not been provided with evidence to confirm this. The appeal decision does not include such a condition and I have not been provided with relevant documentation relating to the scheme³ to widen the front driveway which has been approved by the Council.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR

³ PLAN/2023/0982