



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/24/3355290**

### **1 Orchard Way Ashford TW15 3AU**

- 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 Dalbir Singh Chana against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/00434/HOU.
  - The proposal is for a *'new roof along with increased ridge height and the installation of a rear facing dormer. Erection of a first floor side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension along with a single storey front extension (following demolition of existing single storey rear extension). Extension towards north and loft'*.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a *new roof along with increased ridge height and the installation of a rear facing dormer. Erection of a first floor side extension and part two storey, part single storey rear extension along with a single storey front extension (following demolition of existing single storey rear extension). Extension towards north and loft'* at 1 Orchard Way Ashford TW15 3AU in accordance with the terms of the application, 24/0434/HOU, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BIRR-AR-23-01 A, BIRR-AR-23-02 A, BIRR-AR-23-03 A, BIRR-AR-23-04B, BIRR-AR-23-05 B, BIRR-AR-23-06 B, BIRR-AR-23-07 B, BIRR-AR-23-08, and BIRR-AR-23-09 A.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

3. No.1 is a detached house located at the end of Orchard Way. Accessed off the dual carriageway, London Road (A30), it is primarily a residential area, although directly opposite the appeal site is a commercial garage.

4. Along the side (northern) boundary is an access drive to an area of garages with the rear of the properties to London Road beyond. The wall to the existing single-storey side projection forms part of that boundary and would be extended as part of the proposal. The main two-storey form would also be increased in depth, with the single-storey element creating a wraparound extension and extending across the full width of the rear elevation.
5. To facilitate the increased depth, a crown roof would be created at a slightly raised height, with a steeper pitch, and a dormer window would be inserted into the rear roof slope. While the Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) does advise that there is a risk that a roof pitch in excess of 45 degrees and large areas of flat roof may be out of character with the locality, it does not preclude these designs where appropriate.
6. The detached form of the existing property with a full hip roof is somewhat of an anomaly, as properties along Orchard Way are mainly semi-detached with ridgelines parallel to the road and detached bungalows to the southern end. There is also variety in the roof forms. The pitch to the row of terraced properties to the other side of the road (Barry Terrace) has a low profile, some of the semis exhibit hip-to-gable extensions, and the large apartment block, beyond the commercial garage, has a crown roof at a three-storey height. Within the context of this mixed roofscape, I do not find that the proposed steep, but symmetrical roof design with a limited width of flat roof would appear incongruous or visually intrusive in the street scene.
7. Being located at the entrance to Orchard Way the flank elevation would be more visible. However, the appeal property is set back from London Road, and the side façade is partially screened in some views by the properties to London Road, and the existing trees. From my observations, extensions are notable to other properties in the vicinity, including rear projections and large box dormers. This includes the immediate neighbour, No.1a, which has a two-storey rear extension which projects a similar depth to that proposed to the appeal property.
8. The combination of alterations would substantially increase the size of the property, nonetheless, the resultant form would not be overly dominant or out of keeping to be harmful to the wider character of the area.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would appropriately integrate with the existing property and the street scene and, therefore, would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would accord with policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (February 2009), which requires developments to respect the character of the area and pay regard to the scale, height, proportion and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land.

## **Conclusion and Conditions**

10. For the reasons set out, the appeal is allowed.
11. In line with the statutory requirements, conditions are required in relation to the commencement of development and the plans for certainty. In the interest of the appearance of the building, I have also included a condition for the materials to match the existing building. The Council have suggested a condition in relation to the first-floor windows in the flank elevation. These are existing windows. They are

not part of the proposed extension, and the rooms they serve would not change; therefore, I do not consider such a condition necessary or reasonable.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR