



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/22/3291635

59 Kingsmead Avenue, Sunbury on Thames TW16 5HL

- 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 David Scotten against the decision of the Council of the Borough of Spelthorne.
 - The application Ref 21/01657/HOU, dated 20 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is an extension to the front of the property with an additional single storey over the garage.
-

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 dwellings on Kingsmead Avenue are predominantly two storey, detached, and finished in a palette of brick, paintwork and tiles. Whilst the building lines are not totally uniform, the dwellings are laid out in a fairly consistent pattern on large plots, with their front faces set well back from the road, particularly at first floor level. This gives the area a spacious and cohesive character.
4. The host property, in common with most other dwellings in the streetscene, has a single storey front projection. It is proposed to erect a first floor above that, and to provide a single storey extension to square off the building's front face.
5. The two storey part of the adjacent house at No 57 is closer to the highway than the two storey parts of other properties in the area, including No 59. However, as a result of this scheme, the two storey front face of the host property would be even closer to the highway than No 57. According to the Council's calculations, it would have a 6.5 metre set back, compared to a range of between 7.5 and 9 metres for Nos 57, 61, 63 and 65, and 9 to 14 metres for Nos 38 to 44 (evens) on the opposite side of the road.
6. As a result, although the scheme would project no further forward than the host's existing garage, in my view its two storey section would be noticeably closer to the highway than most nearby properties. Consequently, whilst there

are many front projecting gables in Kingsmead Avenue as illustrated in Section 9 of the appellant's statement, this one would stand out looking along the line of dwellings from the north.

7. In particular, its two storey side wall and gable would step well forward of the two storey parts of the similarly designed and similarly positioned properties at Nos 61 and 63. Notwithstanding the use of matching brickwork, it would thus appear as an unduly prominent and incongruous feature in the streetscene, and it would significantly diminish the area's spacious character.
8. Whilst the appellant describes the host's flat roofed garage as an awkward feature, it is very subordinate in scale, and is consistent with the streetscene's prevailing pattern of single storey front projections.
9. For the above reasons, 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, layout, building lines and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land.
10. The Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011 ('SPD') also refers to the significant impact that front extensions can have on an area and, at paragraph 3.34, requires them to be behind the building line unless they would not detract from the streetscene. This proposal would conflict with that advice.
11. Whilst I note that there were no objections from neighbours, as it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, the scheme would conflict with the development plan and the SPD. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR