



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3361252

22 Cecil Road, Ashford, Surrey TW15 1RJ

- 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 M Zaheer against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01318/HOU.
 - The development proposed is extension of loft.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The officer's report mentions that emerging Policy PS2 (Designing Places and Spaces) of the Pre-Submission Spelthorne Local Plan 2022-2037 is relevant to the proposal. I am not aware that this Policy has been through examination and, if it has, whether there are any outstanding objections or requirements for modification. Therefore, my consideration of this appeal has been determined primarily on the adopted policies of the development plan.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area: and,
 - whether the proposal would provide suitable living conditions for occupiers of the host dwelling, with particular regard to light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. In the vicinity of the site, Cecil Road is characterised by a variety of housing styles, including many modestly proportioned houses and bungalows. The detached appeal dwelling sits at the end of a group of three properties that share similar chalet-style designs with pitched roofs incorporating front facing gables. These dwellings are similarly aligned behind their front gardens. There is an access way to one side of the site that separates it from a short two-storey terrace of houses.

The appeal dwelling is set forward of this terrace, which allows for clear views of its side elevation.

6. I observed that the appeal dwelling was undergoing construction works including the implementation of substantial ground floor rear extensions and large, flat-roofed, flank dormers. Nevertheless, elements of the dwelling's original design and its visual connections to the other chalet-style properties remained evident, particularly in terms of the retained front gable and the comparable depth of the dwelling's main roof.
7. The significant extension in depth to the main roof, together with the considerable bulk of the extended flat-roofed dormers, would have a dominant appearance which would overwhelm the original design and scale of the host dwelling. This would unacceptably differentiate the host dwelling from the neighbouring chalet-style dwellings in the row and the generally more modest roof forms and depths of other dwellings on the street.
8. Although its design takes account of the existing ridgeline, would incorporate matching external materials and the dormers would have a symmetrical appearance, the disparities in the depth and massing with other roof forms on Cecil Road would be prominent to passers-by, particularly in views across the frontage of the neighbouring two-storey terrace. This visual prominence would not be offset by the ground floor works which, due to their single-storey scale, have a more discreet presence.
9. Even if the proposal complies with some of the detailed design guidance set out in Spelthorne Borough Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development: Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD), there would be conflict with its general approach which sets out that extensions should not over dominate the host building.
10. I conclude the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy EN1 (Design of New Development) of the Spelthorne Borough Council Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD) (2009) which requires new developments to respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area in which they are situated. For the same reasons there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

11. The construction works that I noted during my site visit in terms of the loft conversion to include flat-roofed flank dormers appeared to relate to part of the development detailed in a Certificate of Lawfulness (24/00679/CPD) (CoL). The drawings relating to the CoL scheme show that the loft conversion includes the provision of two bedrooms and indicates the 'proposed flank wall windows to be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m from FFL'.
12. From the evidence submitted through this appeal, it is clear that the proposal relates to a loft extension to provide a gym and a TV/games room. With regards to the bedrooms at the loft level, there would be no change in the position or size of windows when compared to the CoL scheme which is being implemented. Furthermore, there is no detailed evidence before me to suggest that there would

be a reduction in the available daylight or sunlight to these bedrooms as a result of the appeal proposal or that there would be deficiencies in light received within the additional rooms resulting from the appeal proposal.

13. As such, the proposal complies with the SPD which recognises the importance for day-to-day tasks and health to allow sufficient daylight into dwellings and sets out that regard should also be had to ensuring no significant loss of sunlight.
14. I conclude the proposal would provide suitable living conditions for occupiers of the host dwelling, with particular regard to light. In that regard, it would accord with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD (2009) which requires a high standard in the design and layout of new development. It would also comply with the high standard of amenity requirements set out in the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. I have found that the proposal would provide suitable living conditions for occupiers of the host dwelling. However, it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and there would be conflict with the development plan in that regard. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR