



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C.** Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3366506

3 Salcombe Road, Ashford, Surrey TW15 3BP

- 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 Amit Kalsi against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is. 25/00146/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the north-west side of Salcombe Road off Stanwell Road in Ashford. It is a residential road. The site is a semi-detached property with its semi-pair being no.1 Salcombe Road. Immediately to the south west of the appeal dwelling is no.3a Salcombe Road which is a detached extended two storey dwelling.
4. The appeal site and its semi-pair present a frontage to the road rather similar in shape to the flank of a Dutch barn, each with one first floor window facing the road. Each property has been extended. Amongst other things, no.1 has a recessed two storey side extension, whilst the appeal dwelling has a single storey side extension, a shallow side dormer and a single storey conservatory-type rear extension.
5. The appeal dwelling sits on a short section of Salcombe Road between Stanwell Road and Ashford Crescent which, on its north west side, comprises detached dwellings other than the appeal property and its semi-pair.
6. The proposed development includes erecting a first floor side extension on top of the existing ground floor side extension. Seen from the front or the rear the shape of the proposal would echo the Dutch barn shape of the main dwelling. This in turn reflects

the first floor side extension which has been permitted and constructed at no.1, the semi-pair.

7. 3a Salcombe Road to the south east of the appeal site has a flat-roofed two storey side extension, in spite of the main roof being traditionally pitched. This extension has been built up to the common boundary with the appeal site and the ground floor side extension at the appeal site has also been built up to the common boundary. The result of this is that there is only centimetres between these built forms of the two properties. Nevertheless, there is a wide visual gap at first floor level facilitated by the fact that there is little built development above the ground floor side extension other than a shallow side dormer. The result is that no.3a and the appeal dwelling do not present as dwellings which are part of a terrace but their separateness continues to be appreciable.
8. Whilst care has been taken to design the proposal so that it provides visual balance to its semi-pair, the visual gap at first floor level above the ground floor side extension next to no.3a would, for the most part, be eradicated, resulting in the appearance of terraced dwellings from almost all angles. This would not be in rhythm with the character and grain of the dwellings on this side of Salcombe Road which, predominantly, leave a clear and appreciable visual gap between each other. These visual breaks between the buildings add positively to the character, openness and appearance of the streetscene. My site visit confirmed that there is a fairly generous gap between the shaped two storey side extension at no.1 Salcombe Road and the detached house to the north east called Travella.
9. I have also noted that the *Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development* Supplementary Planning Document (April 2011) 'SPD' looks for a minimum set-in from the boundary of 1 metre, and seeks to avoid a terracing effect. It is important not to apply SPD over-rigidly but in this case these guidelines do signal that in this case the character of the streetscene would be detrimentally affected by the proposal.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene and would be contrary to policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Development Plan Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (adopted 2009) and the SPD.

Conclusion

11. I have considered all representations made including the desire to use land efficiently, however, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector