



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/20/3257460

21 Gaston Bridge Road, Shepperton TW17 8HH

- 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 Lee Finnerty against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00436/HOU, dated 14 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey, part two storey side and rear extension; single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of the area, and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 23 Gaston Bridge Road (No 23) with specific regard to any overbearing effect.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a detached, two storey house, with an existing single-storey flat-roofed garage to the boundary with No 23, and an alleyway between the house and boundary with No 21. The site has a basic form and scale which is consistent with many of its neighbours. Although some have been extended or otherwise altered, the consistency of form and design is clear, as is the spatial relationship between the houses, with the gaps between them generally provided and maintained by the single-storey side elements and stand-offs from the boundaries. The appeal site and its neighbours are somewhat unusually open to view, being on a single-sided road set down from the distributor road to the front.
4. Given the consistent form and rhythm to the street scene provided by the layout and design of the houses, I consider that the appeal proposal would appear to close the gap to No 23. This would cause a terracing effect between those two houses that would be particularly obvious in views along the road. This would be heightened by the curve in the road and the staggered relationship of the site to its neighbours.
5. I note that some properties along Gaston Bridge Road, which appear to have the same original form and scale to the appeal site, have been extended to the side, and I note other examples cited by the appellant. However, in each case,

the relationship of the house to its plot, neighbours and the wider street-scene is different to the particular circumstances of the appeal before me. As such, they do not alter my conclusions, and I am satisfied that my decision on the effect of this proposal on the character and appearance of the area is consistent with those alterations.

6. As a result, I consider that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, by giving rise to a terracing effect. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, adopted 2009 (the Policies DPD) and the guidance in the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (the SPD). These seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of a high quality, has due regard to the scale, proportions and layout of the area, has a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties and positively contributes to the character of the area.

Living conditions

7. The existing single-storey flat-roofed part of the appeal site is immediately adjacent to a single-storey extension to the neighbouring property, No 23, which has front and rear facing windows. The Council suggests that these windows do not serve a habitable room, and the appellant notes that they are secondary windows, but I do not have floor plans or other details to verify that.
8. Nevertheless, whilst the roof of the proposal does fall towards the boundary with No 23, the proposal would still result in an increase in the height and length of the wall along the boundary. Although the appeal property already projects beyond the neighbouring windows, the increase in the projection of the wall forwards and backwards relative to these windows would be substantial. Given the orientation of the properties, and the overall increase in the bulk and scale of the appeal site, this would result in an unacceptable overbearing and tunnelling effect to those windows.
9. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EN1 of the Policies DPD and the guidance in the SPD. These seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development has a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR