



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/21/3281886
55 Chertsey Road, Ashford TW15 1SR

- 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 Sajjan Hooda against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00754/HOU, dated 1 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part one, part two storey flank extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The buildings along this stretch of Chertsey Road are diverse in terms of their age, style, and proportions, and include semi-detached, detached and terraced properties, along with apartment blocks. The gaps between the individual buildings vary in size.
4. However, within that variety, the two storey dwellings from 55 to 59 (odds), which I understand were constructed by the same builder, are a cohesive group. Viewed from Chertsey Road they are set back a similar distance from, but at an angle to, the highway; have a regular gap to the side above ground floor level; and have a principally hipped roof form. Notwithstanding some differences in their facing materials, and that No 55 has a ground floor front extension instead of a bay window, in the streetscene they form a small, but distinctive, group.
5. A Certificate of Lawfulness has been granted on the host property for a single storey side extension, which would be of the same width and length as the scheme before me; and which appeared to be under construction at the time of my visit.
6. However, unlike that scheme, the appeal proposal would be two storeys high, and according to the appellant the gap to No. 57, whose two storey side face is

constructed to the boundary, would be just 200mm. This scheme would therefore significantly close the gap to No 57 above ground floor level; and whilst I have found that the gaps between buildings in the wider area are varied, here it would have the affect of disrupting the cohesion of this group.

7. Moreover, the proposal would significantly increase the bulk of the host. This would be in part due to its gabled roof, which would face No 57, and which would appear as a dominant feature. It would be markedly at odds with the principally hipped roof form of the host and the other dwellings in this group.
8. Given these dwellings' staggered siting relative to the road, and the scheme's set back, particularly at first floor, relative to the host's front face, the proposed extension would not be visible in longer views approaching the site along Chertsey Road. However, closer to the site, and particularly from the opposite pavement, the harm that I have found the scheme would cause to the character and appearance of the area would be clearly apparent.
9. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 which sets out, amongst other things, that development should respect, and make a positive contribution to, the streetscene, paying due regard to matters such as the scale, height, proportions and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land. It would also conflict with the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 for development to be sympathetic to local character.
10. Additionally, it would fail to comply with the broadly similar stance in the Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011, including its advice at paragraph 3.36 that side extensions should avoid a terracing effect where the loss of characteristic regular gaps gives the impression of an almost continuous built frontage, and at paragraph 3.51 that roof design is critical and should match the host.
11. For those reasons, having regard to all other matters raised, including a representation on behalf of a local resident, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR