



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/24/3339668

4 Russington Road, Shepperton, Surrey TW17 8HN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr James Beattie against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01410/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as "double storey side and rear wrap around extension with front porch."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for development described as "double storey side and rear wrap around extension with front porch" at 4 Russington Road, Shepperton, Surrey TW17 8HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01410/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: RRP01, RRP05, RRP06 – Elevations proposed, RRP06 – First Floor Plan-Proposed, RRP07
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The Council has referred to both their adopted Core Strategy and Draft Spelthorne Local Plan 2022 – 2037. The draft plan is at pre-submission stage and limited weight should thus be afforded thereto. In any event, the reason for refusal only refers to the current Core Strategy which is the adopted development plan for decision making purposes. I have accordingly referred to it below.
4. The Council do not object to the single storey front extension element of the appeal scheme. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions. My recommendation therefore focusses on the double storey side and rear wrap

around extension and, specifically, its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached building with surrounding units of a similar nature. It is within an independent pocket of 4 buildings. Their siting is staggered with no uniform building line. In the immediate vicinity, many of the dwellings have been extended to the side and the front, including the group in which the appeal building is sat. Surrounding buildings tend to have large open front gardens. Despite some spacing, the appeal building and its immediate associates read as a block due to their clustered and altered appearance.
6. The appeal proposal would only be seen from the street when standing directly in front. Resultantly, there would be some appearance of terracing as the extension is to abut the neighbouring dwelling and would result in some loss of the gap between the properties. However, the proposal is to be set back from Number 4 and substantially set back from Number 6. It is also to be set down from the existing eaves and ridgeline showing subservience. Consequently, the views of the proposal when entering and exiting the cul-de-sac will be limited due to the staggered building line and its design. Moreover, the previous extensions to neighbouring properties have already resulted in some loss of the open character on this side of the road. As a result, the current appearance of the street scene will remain relatively unchanged, and the terracing effect would be minimal. The spacious character of the area would be secured due to the retention of substantial front gardens.
7. With these matters in mind, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would comply with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009) and Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development (2011) which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Conditions

8. I have set out the standard time limit condition and referred to the approved plans for enforcement purposes. In addition, it is necessary to add a condition to ensure that the materials used are to match the host dwelling and to thus be in keeping with the building and the area.
9. The Council has recommended a condition for no openings without prior authorisation to be created in the eastern and western flanks of the extension. However, such a condition would not be necessary as a separate permission or compliance with the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) 2015, Schedule 2, Part 1 would be needed for the insertion of new openings therein.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR