
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2021

by Martin Chandler BSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/21/3276855

69 Thames Side, Staines-Upon-Thames TW18 2HF

- 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 Ian Mitchell against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00341/HOU, dated 1 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 3M extension at ground level and changes to the existing West gable elevation. The construction of a study at the rear, the replacement of the existing garage roof, and the construction of a glazed covered walkway linking the study with the kitchen doorway.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a 3M extension at ground level and changes to the existing West gable elevation. The construction of a study at the rear, the replacement of the existing garage roof, and the construction of a glazed covered walkway linking the study with the kitchen doorway, at 69 Thames Side, Staines-Upon-Thames TW18 2HF, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 21/00341/HOU, dated 1 March 2021, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development shall commence within three years of the date of this permission;
 - 2) The development shall be implemented strictly in accordance with the following drawing numbers: TS20 01; TS20 03 C; TS20 04 C; and TS20 10.
 - 3) The materials used in the external appearance of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is currently occupied by a detached dwelling which presents its gable end towards the River Thames. It is one of five comparable dwellings that enjoy a pleasing outlook over the river with amenity space located adjacent to the river footpath. The amenity spaces are enclosed with low level enclosures which ensure that the rear elevations of the houses are prominent and exposed to the river. The comparable properties also demonstrate a staggered building line. Due to the similarity of the properties, the staggered

- building line, and their prominence, the uniformity of the houses makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
4. However, beyond the five dwellings, the broader surroundings demonstrate an inherent variety in the architecture that is readily visible from the river. Accordingly, in my judgement, the uniformity of the dwellings represents one component in an otherwise varied street scene. As a consequence, the positive contribution that the houses make to the broader environment is limited, and therefore, I see no reason why sympathetic alterations could not be supported to the prominent rear elevations.
 5. The proposal would introduce a single storey, flat roof extension to the rear of the property. Accordingly, it would demonstrably alter the composition of the rear elevation, thereby diluting the uniformity of the adjacent dwellings. However, the extension would be well-proportioned and would be suitably respectful to the host dwelling. Individually therefore, it would be a pleasing addition to the property. Moreover, due to the staggered building line and the depth of the extension, it would not project beyond the adjacent neighbour to the south of the site. Accordingly, it would not represent an imposing or overly dominant alteration. Instead, I am entirely satisfied that the proposal would introduce a well-considered extension that would be suitably sympathetic and respectful to the immediately neighbouring houses, as well as contributing to the more varied broader surroundings.
 6. The proposal also includes other alterations, but the Council found no harm in relation to these matters. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, for the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009) which seeks amongst other things, development of a high standard in the design and layout of new development.

Other Matters

7. The proposed balcony would be larger than the balcony that is currently in situ. However, due to the presence of balconies as well as the exposed nature of the rear amenity spaces, I am satisfied that the proposal would not materially alter the privacy of neighbouring gardens. Accordingly, I find that there is no need to require screening for the proposed balcony. I am also satisfied that due to the height and depth of the proposal, it would not materially alter existing light levels received by neighbouring properties.
8. In light of my findings, conditions are necessary to establish the time limit for commencing development, as well as to list the approved drawing numbers. In addition, to ensure a suitable finish, a condition is necessary requiring facing materials to match those used on the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR