



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/25/3373285

67 Inkerman Road, Knaphill, Woking, Surrey GU21 2BG

- 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 Davies against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is PLAN/2025/0401.
 - The development proposed is the formation of a rear dormer and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on -
 - The character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, with particular regard to loss of privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is part of a 1980s residential development of properties set back from Inkerman Road. It is laid out with car parks to the front and the properties within a landscaped setting, accessible only on foot. There is a unity to the brick-and-timber-clad houses of the same form, wrapping around green spaces, creating a sense of cohesion and enclosure. From my observations, there are limited alterations to these properties, and I did not see any dormer windows.
4. No.67 is a mid-terrace house with the rear roofscape visible from Inkerman Road. The proposed box-style dormer would cover the majority of the roof, creating a dominant feature. This is contrary to the advice in the Council's Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for modest roof extensions, with dormers of traditional form supported where they are to be a subservient feature and in keeping with the character of the dwelling.
5. The proposed dormer would be constructed in materials to match the existing property, and the fenestration would align with that of the first floor. Nonetheless, the bulk and scale of the flat roof addition running off the ridgeline would be an incongruous and prominent feature. The proposal would not affect the layout of

development and thereby the principle of separating housing from vehicles, but it would disrupt the homogeneity of the properties, which form part of the development's design aesthetic, and views of the estate from the street.

6. Whilst I recognise the need for properties to evolve and a capacity for change, the addition of the large-scale dormer would be an obtrusive feature, harmful to the overall character of the area.
7. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with policies C21 and C24 of the Woking Core Strategy October 2012 (Core Strategy), which requires development to create places with their own identity, to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area, paying regard to the characteristics of adjoining buildings and townscape character. There would also be conflict with the advice in the Design SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which promote high-quality design.

Neighbours

8. The development does not have a regular, linear layout. The rear of the appeal property is oriented towards the end of the rear gardens of Nos. 57, 59 and 61, with a footpath between the properties.
9. The separation distance between the houses is less than the 30m set out in the Council's SPD – Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (February 2022), as adequate to prevent overlooking from a third storey level. However, the neighbouring properties to the rear are at an oblique angle and do not have a direct back-to-back arrangement. Due to the close-knit nature of the development, there is a mutual level of overlooking, and existing landscaping helps to filter views. Whilst the proposed roof-level window would allow for a more elevated outlook and views would be more exposed in winter months, given the juxtaposition between the properties, I do not find that this would result in a substantial loss of privacy for the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
10. The proposed dormer would be seen from the neighbouring properties but would be set sufficiently away not to be overbearing. Its visual presence and change to the appearance of the appeal property would, nonetheless, contribute to the effect of the proposed development on the character of the area, as considered above.
11. In conclusion on this matter, I do not find that the proposal would result in direct overlooking that would be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. As such, the proposed development would accord with Core Strategy policy CS21, which, amongst other things, seeks that developments achieve a satisfactory relationship with adjoining properties, avoiding significant harmful impacts, including a loss of privacy. Taken as a whole, the proposal would accord with the similar principles of the SPD and the Framework, which promote a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge that dormer windows are often permitted development and that there are some box-style dormers to properties in the wider area, including those identified by the appellant along Inkerman Road. The background to these is not before me; however, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits, and the

appeal property is part of a defined development with its own character. The original planning permission for that development includes a condition restricting alterations, which probably accounts for the limited changes other than those primarily screened by boundary fencing, such as conservatories, single-storey extensions and garden sheds.

13. I understand the appellant's desire to increase the size of their property and recognise the efforts they have taken to do this, including undertaking pre-application advice, discussing the proposal with the residents' association, and engaging an architect. These matters, however, do not alter my assessment of the proposal against the development plan.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR