

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2025 by R Pankhurst

### Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25<sup>th</sup> June 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/24/3357417

#### 34 Hawkewood Road, Surrey, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 6HJ

- 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 A Marrow (Elmbridge Building Control Services) against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01165/HOU.
  - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension, single storey front extension and construction of 3 number front dormers following demolition of existing rear extension and all dormers.
- 

### 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.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 36 Hawkewood Road with particular regard to outlook and light.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

#### *Character and Appearance*

4. The appeal property is a two storey, detached dwelling with a half-hipped roof, front dormers and a cat slide element over its forward projection. It is located within a residential area where the surrounding properties are detached with similar features which are characteristic of what the Council refer to as the 'Berg' style. However, there is variation in the street scene with various additions including two storey rear extensions.
5. The proposed two storey rear extension would add considerable scale and bulk to the appeal property. The crown roof would match the height of the ridge line of the existing property with two storey eaves height and an area of flat roof. It would be visually apparent from the street, as is evident from similar two storey extensions in the area, due to the characteristic gaps between properties along Hawkewood Road. Nonetheless, it would not look out of character in the context of other properties along Hawkewood Road, several of which have similar two storey rear

extensions. The key features which are characteristic of the 'Berg' style would remain at the appeal property when viewed from the front. To this extent, the proposed rear extension would not unduly impact the distinct identity of the surrounding area. I therefore find no harm to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area from this element of the proposal.

6. Neither the Council nor any other party has raised any objection to the single storey front extension or the three front dormers. It was clear on my site visit that these are common features in the local area and would not detract from the street scene. Consequently, I find no harm to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area from these elements either.
7. The Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) suggests that rear extensions are just as important as the front and should normally be subordinate to the host property in both scale and design. While I appreciate the two storey rear extension would noticeably remodel the form of the appeal property to the rear, it would do so in a manner that is not out of keeping with the established pattern of development in the area. I do not share the Council's view that there is clear design consistency to the rear of the dwellings in this part of the street, as a number of dwellings in the vicinity have two storey rear extensions.
8. I acknowledge that other properties along Hawkewood Road with two storey rear extensions may have been granted permission prior to the Council's current Local Plan. However, they are nevertheless common enough to be part of the established character of the rear of these properties. I have made my recommendation on this appeal on its own merits, having regard to this context.
9. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (adopted 2009) (Core Strategy) insofar as it requires a high standard in the design and layout of new development.

#### *Living Conditions*

10. The proposed two storey extension would not significantly change the outlook from the ground floor side window of No 36 which directly faces the boundary fence and therefore has a very restricted outlook already. The first-floor side window of No 36 also faces the side of No 34 however it currently has some outlook towards the front and rear of that property over the slope of the roof. The proposed rear extension would obscure and restrict the outlook from this window towards the rear garden of No 34 and introduce a two-storey wall instead. Due to the bulk and proximity of this extension, this would appear overbearing and would harmfully reduce the outlook from that window.
11. The patio of No 36 incorporates a seating area and, from the evidence before me, it appears to be a well-used space. The patio currently has an open outlook across that property's rear garden but is restricted towards the appeal site due to the fence and vegetation along the boundary. Although there was previously an extension at the rear of the appeal property, it was single storey with a flat roof, so would have had a limited impact on the outlook from this area.

12. The proposed two-storey rear extension would be considerably taller than the previous extension and the existing fence and vegetation. It therefore would be substantially larger and bulkier than the previous extension, and the partially pitched roof would do little to reduce its visual bulk and massing. While the open outlook from the patio to the rear would remain, the depth, height and proximity of the proposed rear extension to the shared boundary would have a dominating and overbearing visual impact when viewed from the patio of No 36. Consequently, the proposed rear extension would have a significant harmful impact on the outlook from the patio of No 36. Overall, therefore, the proposal would result in a significant harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 36 with regard to outlook.
13. The patio area of No 36 is partly shaded in the early morning by the existing rear extension on that property. There are large trees to the rear of the plot but they are some distance from the patio, so it receives sunlight during the middle part of the day. The proposed rear extension would result in greater shading of the patio in the late afternoon than the existing situation, however this would be for a relatively short period and would therefore not result in a significant loss of sunlight to that area. The side windows of No 36 are already shaded by No 34 in the late afternoon so there would be no significant impact on sunlight to those windows as a result of the proposal. Therefore, while the proposal would have an effect on sunlight to No 36, this would not be sufficient to have a significant harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of that property.
14. The proposal would therefore harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No 36 with regard to outlook, but not sunlight. Nevertheless, it would conflict with that part of Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy which requires development to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

15. I have found no harm in relation to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, or its effect on the sunlight received by No 36. However, this does not outweigh the harm identified to the living conditions of No 36 in respect of outlook, and the resulting policy conflict. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be **dismissed**.

*R Pankhurst*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

### **Inspector's Decision**

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*L McKay*

INSPECTOR