



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/23/3326719

4 Burgoyne Road, Sunbury-on-Thames, Surrey, TW16 7PW.

- 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 S Salim (Armamar Homes Ltd). against the decision of Spelthorn Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00443/HOU, dated 4 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the *construction of a part two, part single storey extension with associated parking and amenity following demolition of existing garage and single storey lean to (granted) – Raise eaves of consented single storey extension to allow accommodation in roof space.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for *construction of a part two, part single storey extension with associated parking and amenity following demolition of existing garage and single storey lean to (granted) – Raise eaves of consented single storey extension to allow accommodation in roof space* at 4 Burgoyne Road, Sunbury-on-Thames, Surrey, TW16 7PW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00443/HOU, dated 4 April 2023, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: L.201, B.201, P.201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208 and 209.

Main Issues

2. I consider that there are two main issues in this case:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property, the semi-detached pair and thereby the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area; and,
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 87 Vicarage Road in terms of the development's potential appear overbearing.

Reasons

First main issue

3. The appeal property, 4 Burgoyne Road is a semi-detached house. The semi-detached pair, numbers 2 and 4, are located on the corner of Burgoyne Road and Vicarage Road.
4. The properties were originally designed as a virtually matching symmetrical pair of narrow frontage dwellings facing Burgoyne Road each with a large side garden. Number 2 has been substantially extended and subdivided into two dwelling, such that now much of the original symmetry of the pair has been significantly denuded. Furthermore, by reason of the alterations to number 2 its main façade now faces towards Vicarage Road.
5. The appellant proposes, following the demolition of the existing garage and single storey lean-to, the construction of a part two, part single storey side extension with raised eaves and a front dormer window to provide accommodation in the roof space. A porch along with associated parking and amenity space is also planned.
6. The Council considered that by virtue of its scale, location and design the proposed extension to number 4 would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings, be out of proportion with the host property and would appear visually obtrusive and incongruous in the street scene and the wider area.
7. The proposed development would by treason of its form and mass further denude the remaining symmetry of the original semi-detached houses. However, having regard to the previous extensive alterations to number 2 I do consider that this development would cause further significant harm in this regard.
8. In my judgement the proposed extension would appear as a well-mannered addition to the dwelling. Given the separation distance to the side wall of number 6, the existing single storey elements, the step down in ridge and eaves height would seem an appropriate design solution here.
9. I accept that the introduction of the dormer would add to the visual bulk of the extension. However, it would in this case serve to break up the mass of the proposed extension and add visual interest to the overall composition of the street scene.
10. For the reason set out above I conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed development would not cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the semi-detached pair or thereby the appearance of the street scene and the wider area. it would therefore accord with the aims of Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (Adopted February 2009) (CS) and the Supplementary Planning Document for the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development (Adopted April 2011) (SPD) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of design and contribute to the street scene and the character of the wider area.

Second main issue

11. The proposed development would extend beyond the side wall of the house by about 6.0 metres or so. However, given the relatively low roof height of the extension, the distance between the rear wall of the proposed addition and the boundary to number 87 Vicarage Road, the built up urban nature of the location and taking into account that the appeal site is located to the north of number 87 I am not persuaded, in this case, that the development would appear so overbearing as to cause significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 87.
12. I therefore conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposal would not result in harm the residential living conditions of the occupiers of 87 Vicarage Road. It would therefore accord with the objectives of criterion b) of CS Policy EN1 as it seeks to avoid significant harmful impact to adjoining occupiers.

Conditions

13. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
14. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR