



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/25/3368491

21 Vicarage Road, Kingfield, Woking, Surrey, GU22 9BH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Muhammad Nauman against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Reference is PLAN/2024/0420.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension following demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a 1960s semi-detached two storey home on a corner plot facing the main Vicarage Road and with its generous side garden running out to Loop Road. House types, sizes and age vary in the locality; building lines along the main road are more varied than the side street. The locality is of suburban residential character and the appeal property and its immediate and wider neighbouring dwellings sit comfortably within the pleasing and spacious appearance of the area. The proposal is as described above with the extension projecting outwards towards Loop Road.
 4. The Appellant understandably feels that greater use could be made of the appeal property's generous side garden. Regrettably the appeal scheme would simply go too far on this front. The mass of the planned structure would project overly forward to Loop Road given the established pattern of buildings and the, almost, consistent building line along this road. The development would look unduly dominant within the local grain of housing layout; a disproportionate and incongruous intrusion into the streetscene at this prominent corner position. The aesthetics would not be helped by the sheer scale of an almost blank side gable wall which would front Loop Road, offering virtually nothing of interest to the streetscene, and merely emphasising that this development would be overlarge and over-proximate to the highway.
-

5. In terms of the impact on the architectural qualities of the presently symmetric semi-detached pair I would not be overly precious about this in principle. However, I do consider that a degree of legibility should be retained and this would call for a more modest and notably subordinate extension than the appeal scheme's almost repetition of the host property. The extension would lack the necessary degree of subservience to retain a visually comfortable front elevation across the two existing semi-detached plots.
6. Policies CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012) (CS) are relevant. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek to ensure that new development has good quality design, suitable massing and scale, and is protective of the character and appearance of the streetscene and its context. This is reflected within principles of the 'Woking's Landscape and Townscape', Supplementary Planning Document 'Design' (2015) (SPD), albeit this is a document which cannot be expected to cover every eventuality. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with the CS policies and the relevant objectives of the SPD.

Other matters

7. I do understand the wish to extend this property and I hope that a satisfactory solution can be found. I have considered the examples of extensions, terraces and asymmetrical semi-detached homes drawn to my attention. However, I found those sites, designs, massing, building lines or the nature of the contexts to be very different from the case in hand with its specific design and scale on this corner plot. In any event I must determine this proposal on its own merits. I appreciate that thought has been given to the selection of materials and, for example, window designs but this would not negate the overall scale and form of this excessive, unfortunately positioned, extension. I take the point that the Officer's Report has some contradictory elements which really should have been picked up by the Council; however, the clearly-expressed issued Decision Notice does logically follow most of the reasoning within that report.
8. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR