



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A3655/D/25/3372006

266 Albert Drive, Woking, GU215TX

- 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 Mrs Shahzana Tabraz against the decision of Woking Borough Council.
 - The application Reference is PLAN/2025/0481.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part single, part two storey rear extension, two storey side extension and part single, part two storey front extension and porch following partial demolition of existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the host property and the locality and b) living conditions for neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The post-war appeal property is a semi-detached two storey home on an estate of broadly similar semi-detached and detached dwellings which for the most-part have generous front and rear gardens. The locality is of established suburban residential character and pleasing, spacious appearance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The appeal scheme would transform the property in scale and form such that the original home would barely be legible, particularly to the side and rear. I would assess the works as architecturally over-whelming to the host property and drawing very little from the prevailing character and appearance of this wider area. Whilst the plots are generous there should still be a need for carefully considering whether extensions would be of suitable sizing and design. Regrettably this unduly bulky proposal would go too far and would fail that test.
 5. 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 local 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.

Living conditions

6. The locality is a relatively spacious one and residents would have an expectation of reasonable ambiance and open outlook. Works to a dwelling should not cause neighbours to feel hemmed-in, but regrettably that is how I would consider the appeal scheme would chime with those residing at No 264. The considerable extent of virtually unrelieved two storey vertical walling, planned for close to the common rear side boundary and set an appreciable distance beyond these neighbours' main rear elevation, would lead to a most uncomfortable sense of being enclosed and an undue overbearing presence. Notwithstanding the Appellant's correct supposition on retention of daylight and sunlight the impact upon the visual space presently enjoyed by neighbouring residents would warrant rejection of the appeal scheme.
7. Previously cited CS Policy CS21 also seeks to protect residential amenity; an objective which is reflected in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document Outlook, Amenity, Privacy and Daylight (2022) (SPD2). I conclude that there would be a breach of this policy in this regard as well as the neighbourliness aims within the SPD2.

Other matters

8. I am aware of the planning permissions which relate to this property including the most recent and extensive scheme under Council Ref PLAN/2025/0187. I appreciate the arguments that the appeal proposal would not increase footprint over this, would lead to greater ease of construction, and may be marginally beneficial to those residing to the north east. However, there is some degree of design subtlety and residential amenity awareness with the approved scheme and matters have now come to a point where the sum total of the extension sought is, in my opinion, excessive from both aesthetic and amenity perspective and this carries greater weight to my mind. I have considered the examples of extensions drawn to my attention. However, I found none of those to be directly comparable in design or siting terms. In any event I must determine this proposal on its own merits.
9. 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 issues identified above.
10. 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

11. 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 as well as on living conditions for neighbours.
Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR