
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2020

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/20/3253735

122 Ashridge Way, Sunbury on Thames TW16 7RR

- 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 Andi Zhobe against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00158/HOU, dated 30 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a rear ground floor extension measuring 6 metres in depth beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling and development of a front porch. First floor rear extension with a depth of three metres with width ensuring 45 degree sight line is maintained from neighbouring windows. Development of loft alterations that would include a hip to gable alteration, the installation of a rear facing dormer with a Juliet balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. At the appeal property the Council has granted planning permission for a 2-storey rear extension (Ref 19/01678/HOU); advised that prior approval is not required for a single storey extension of 6- metres in depth (Ref 19/01704/PDH) and issued as Certificate of Lawful Development for roof alterations (Ref 19/01679/CPD). Each of these alterations to the property could potentially be implemented on an individual basis.
4. The appeal scheme includes the erection of all the previously identified alterations as a single building operation and the appellant acknowledges that planning permission is required. The Councils *Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) includes guidance concerning the design and scale of extensions. The SPD refers to extensions not over dominating the host building and being designed to appear subordinate.
5. The property is a 2-storey dwelling which is situated at the end of a terrace of 4 properties of similar design albeit only 2 of these dwellings have been altered

at the rear. The property is located within a predominantly residential area of similar dwelling types and a number have been altered, including rear dormers, single and 2-storey rear extensions and hip to gable roof alterations. None of the dwellings were observed to have been extended to the same degree as if the appeal was allowed at the property.

6. By reason of its cumulative scale and design, the proposed development would significantly increase the size and bulk of the host property. There would also be a significant increase in the footprint and floorspace of the extended dwelling when compared to the host property. Although there are extensions to some of the adjacent dwellings, this significant increase in the size of the property would not reflect the scale other similarly design dwellings, even as they have been altered, and would result in an uncharacteristic form of residential development when compared to the dwellings within the surrounding area.
7. Although there are individual fallback positions to which significant weight is given in the determination of this appeal, the proposed development has been assessed on its own circumstances. Accordingly, this is a case where the cumulative scale of the individual elements forming part of the proposed development would result in a physically and visually dominant addition to the property rather than being a subordinate extension.
8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would conflict with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Development Plan Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document and the SPD. Amongst other matters, this policy requires new development to have a high standard of design and to also have due regard to the scale, proportions and characteristics of adjoining buildings. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR