The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by Adrian Hunter BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/20/3255429
18 Glebe Road, Staines-Upon-Thames TW18 1BX

- 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 Ralph Young against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
- The application Ref 20/00446/HOU, dated 4 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2020.
- The development proposed is erection of detached outbuilding in rear garden area to provide garage and summerhouse/gym.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of detached outbuilding in rear garden area to provide garage and summerhouse/gym at 18 Glebe Road, Staines-Upon-Thames TW18 1BX in accordance with the terms of the application, 20/00446/HOU, dated 4 April 2020, subject to the following conditions:

    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 following approved plans: KJT/Glebe/100a; KJT/Glebe/101a; and KJT/Glebe/102a.

    3. The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials as detailed on the application form.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single storey, detached family dwelling, which, at the time of my visit was in the process of being extended. Dwellings are set back from the road, within relatively large plots, with a number having been extended over the years. The style of the surrounding dwellings varies along the street, with views into the rear gardens restricted by their presence. Within the surrounding area, there are a number of ancillary outbuildings to the rear of existing properties.

4. The proposed development is a single storey, detached outbuilding, located adjacent to the rear boundary of the appeal site. It has a pitched roof and extends across the majority of the width of the plot.

5. The building would be of a considerable size, bulk and footprint when compared with the floorspace of the host dwelling. In this respect, the outbuilding would not be subordinate to the main dwelling. Despite its size and bulk, it would however largely hidden behind the existing host building and, when viewed from the street, would only visible in limited, glimpsed views down the side of the existing property. It therefore does not detract from the character of the area through over dominance or obtrusiveness. Furthermore, I note that planning permission has been granted for the existing building to be extended to create a two-storey dwelling. Given this, whilst it constitutes a large building, the development would not have a significant effect, such that the withholding of planning permission on these grounds alone would not be warranted.

6. Nonetheless, any lack of visibility from public areas alone does not justify the development plan's or the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) requirement to achieve good design. The proposed outbuilding would be of a modern design, drawing inspiration from the existing house in terms of its finished materials and external appearance. Given the surrounding mix of house designs, the overall appearance of the outbuilding would therefore not be out of context. Furthermore, due to the size and dimensions of the plot, the appeal property would still retain a reasonably sized rear garden, which even given the presence of the outbuilding, would be in keeping with the wider area. As such, whilst the outbuilding would be relatively large, it would not be overly dominant or introduce a form of development that would be out of keeping with the established pattern of development.

7. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and, in this respect, is in accordance with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009), the Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development (2011) and paragraph 127 of The Framework. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure a high standard of design which is compatible with their surroundings.

Other matters

8. Reference has been made to the potential for the appeal property to become a separate residential dwelling. No evidence has been put to me to substantiate this point, however in any event, such a use would require a new planning permission, with the Council having the opportunity to assess the proposal against the development plan policies in place at that time.

Conclusion

9. I conclude, for the reasons outlined above, that the appeal should be allowed subject to the identified conditions.

Adrian Hunter

INSPECTOR