

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2023

**by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 29 June 2023.**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/23/3318530**

### **8 Celia Crescent, Ashford TW15 3NW**

- 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 Coates against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
  - The application, Ref. 22/01589/HOU, dated 14 November 2022 was refused by notice dated 5 January 2023.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey side/rear extension (following demolition of the existing single storey structure and conservatory) and the erection of a single storey front 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 host dwelling; No. 6 as the other half of the pair, and the street scene of Celia Crescent. As regards the latter, with its corner position the appeal dwelling, and indeed No. 7 opposite, have increased prominence because they can be seen in longer east/west views along the Crescent.

### **Reasons**

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow with No. 6 and comprises one of four such pairs of essentially the same original design (two pairs on each side of the road opposite one another) in this part of Celia Crescent. Despite modest differences in their principal elevations and the hip to gable addition at the appeal dwelling, these eight properties provide a pleasing symmetry.
  4. Turning firstly to the proposed front extension, the appearance of the front elevation has already been affected by the hip to gable roof extension. And the appeal scheme would result in a further departure from the original building by infilling the existing set back and extending the ground floor almost to the forwardmost part of the gable.
  5. The side extension would complete the infilling of the building's footprint across the whole width of the plot and at the same time increase the bulk of the frontage at the expense of its original design merit. The side extension's replacement of the existing unsightly lean-to is to a limited degree a point in its
-

favour. However, this is outweighed by the inappropriateness of the built form extending to the back of the pavement for the full depth of the dwelling with no regard to the need for bungalow to respect the constraints of the plot itself and the visual amenity of the street scene. Both the front and side extensions are of a size to necessitate crown roofs as part of their design.

6. The proposed large flat roofed rear addition would occupy the full width of the original building and the submitted plans indicate a likelihood of its roof and the upper parts of the rear wall being seen from Celia Avenue over the boundary wall. To the extent that this occurs, it would be read in conjunction the existing large flat roofed box dormer which dominates the appearance of the rear of the building.
7. I have carefully considered the grounds of appeal and I acknowledge that the proposal would enlarge the accommodation at the property. However, the appeal scheme, with its cumulative bulk and proliferation of flat / crown roofs amounts to an excessive and insensitive enlargement of the building which in common with its immediate neighbours was clearly carefully designed to form an attractive part of the street scene. In addition, I consider that the proposal amounts to an overdevelopment of this modestly sized plot.
8. The effect of the development would be one of harmful conflict with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009; the Council's 'Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development' Supplementary Planning Document 2011, and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
9. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR