



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/22/3309327

2 Ripston Road, Ashford TW15 1PQ

- 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 Lokesh Nagpal against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 22/01010/HOU, dated 14 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as it more accurately describes the full extent of the proposal.
3. The proposed extension has a total depth of 8m, however there appears to be discrepancies with the extent of the extension as shown on the Site Plan¹. I have therefore considered the proposal as shown on the floor and elevation plans and my observations on site.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties (Nos.17 & 19 Goffs Road).

Reasons

5. No.2 Ripston Road is a detached, two-storey property within a comparatively large 'L' shaped plot which wraps around the rear of No.4 Ripston Road. To the other side are properties in Goff Road with the gardens to Nos.15-21 (odds) adjoining the eastern boundary. The area comprises a mixture of two storey and single storey properties, although those immediately surrounding the appeal site are predominantly bungalows/chalet bungalows.
6. The proposed rear extension would significantly increase the depth of the property creating an expansive blank facade to each side and resulting in two of the bedrooms having no windows. The gardens to the properties in Goffs Road are modest, and the flank elevation being extended is less than 1m from

¹ Drawing Number A125Hs-V4-6 Rev 4

the shared boundary. The resultant flank wall would project along the entire length of the boundary with No.17, and the flank to rear separation distance would be significantly less than the 13.5m sought in the Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

7. As a result, and together with the existing structures to No.15 to the south, No.17 would be enclosed by built form. The imposing nature is amplified by the difference in height and even the single storey element would extend some distance above the existing boundary treatment. Due to the close proximity and the scale of development there would be an unacceptable overbearing impact and a loss of outlook for the occupiers of No.17. Additionally due to the orientation there would be a loss of sunlight to the garden in the afternoon/evening.
8. Given the existing relationship there is an outlook from the rear upper windows of the appeal property over the gardens in Goffs Road. However, the extension would position the windows further back and a limited distance from the boundary with No.19. Consequently, there would both be an increased loss of privacy and a perceived sense of intrusive overlooking for the occupiers of No.19 which would have an adverse effect on the enjoyment of their home.
9. Overall, the scale, design and siting of the extension would result in a poor relationship with the neighbouring properties in Goffs Road to the harmful detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos.17 and 19. The proposal would thereby be contrary to policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (CS), which amongst other things requires that development achieve satisfactory relationships to adjoining properties avoiding harmful impacts. Similarly, it would be contrary to the related guidance and separation distances set out in the SPD.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the proposed materials and form of the extension would match with the existing property, and it would not result in any changes to the Ripston Road street scene. Nonetheless, there are no identified benefits in the public interest of the extension which would outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR