



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5th September 2025

by Simon J Cater MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/25/3368478

113 Lovelace Drive, Pyrford, Woking, Surrey GU22 8SB

- 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 Matthew Jones against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2025/0130.
 - The development is ground floor rear extension, garage conversion, alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor rear extension, garage conversion, alterations to fenestration at 113 Lovelace Drive, Pyrford, Woking, Surrey GU22 8SB in accordance with the terms of the application ref. PLAN/2025/0130, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No: BR06 Rev E - Ground Floor GA Plan, Drawing No: BR08 Rev C - First Floor GA and Lower Roof Plan and Drawing No: BR09 Rev B - Proposed Elevations

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, the proposed development had been implemented. My assessment, however, is based on the submitted plans and supporting documentation.

Main Issue

3. The Council raises no objection to the rear extension or garage conversion and the principal matter in dispute concerns the proposed anthracite grey aluminium windows. Given this, the main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations to fenestration on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a detached, two-storey dwelling occupying a prominent corner plot at the junction of Lovelace Drive and Bray Gardens. The appeal property previously had white-framed uPVC windows, which on my site visit I noted that these have been removed and replaced with the windows proposed in this appeal.
5. Photographic evidence submitted by the Appellant, together with my own observations during the site visit, confirms that grey and other dark-framed

windows are present on nearby properties, including No. 46, No. 64 and No. 120 Lovelace Drive, one of which is a property directly opposite the appeal site. These examples reflect an emerging pattern of fenestration variation along Lovelace Drive, which the proposal would complement without undermining the overall coherence of the street scene. Whilst the Council considers the example opposite the site to be an anomaly, and no evidence has been provided to confirm that planning permission was obtained

6. The evidence before me and my own observations indicates that there are a number of anthracite grey and other dark-framed windows present on properties in the surrounding area (No. 46, No. 64 and No. 120), and that, even if it is the case that some of these alterations have taken place without the benefit of planning permission, these alterations appear to have altered the pattern and appearance of fenestration in the area such that the proposal would not appear out of character with its surroundings.
7. Given the presence of similar treatments nearby, the proposal would not represent a departure from the established pattern of development, nor would it set a harmful precedent.
8. The scale, siting, and materials of the proposed alterations are sympathetic to the host dwelling and would not result in material harm to the character or appearance of the area.
9. The proposal accords with Policies CS21 and CS24 of the Woking Core Strategy (2012), which collectively seek high-quality design that respects and enhances local character and townscape, including considerations such as materials and boundary treatments, the Woking Design SPD (2015) which encourages contextual responsiveness, and Policy BE1 of the Pyrford Neighbourhood Plan (2017) which supports development that respects the established character of the area.

Conditions

10. The Council recommended conditions relating to commencement, materials, and approved plans. As the development has already been implemented, a commencement condition, requiring the development to begin within three years, is unnecessary and would serve no useful planning purpose. Similarly, a materials condition is not required, as the materials used are evident on site. However, in the interests of clarity and certainty, a condition listing the approved plans has been imposed.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR