



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5th September 2025

by **Simon J Cater MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3367822

59 Kingsmead Avenue, Sunbury-on-Thames, Surrey TW16 5HL

- 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 David Scotten against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00395/HOU.
 - The development is erection of a single storey front extension, a front dormer and conversion of
 - the existing garage into a habitable room
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description from the Council's decision notice, which appears to better reflect the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of a group of detached dwellings of similar scale and design, characterised by consistent roof forms and restrained architectural detailing. Dormer windows are not a defining feature of this group. Whilst the appellant points to dormers at Nos. 27, 34, and 37 Kingsmead Avenue as evidence of change within the street scene, these examples are typically integrated into a full width catslide roof that span the entire slope, maintaining a degree of visual coherence. As such, although dormers do exist in the wider area, their design and integration are such that they do not significantly disrupt the prevailing character or rhythm of the street scene.
5. The Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2011) advises at paragraph 3.56 that dormers should be subordinate to the roof and be well designed and proportioned.
6. The proposal introduces a dormer above a partial width catslide roof to the front elevation, which would be added specifically to accommodate the dormer. Although modest in scale and set in from the roof edges, the dormer would occupy a narrowed section of roof, making it appear visually dominant and poorly integrated

with the overall roof form. Its design contrasts with the pitched roofs of neighbouring dwellings and would be readily visible in views along Kingsmead Avenue.

7. Whilst the front extension and garage conversion would broadly respect the established building line, the introduction of the catslide roof and dormer would undermine the coherence of the roofscape. Rather than appearing as a natural extension of the existing form, the dormer would read as an awkward and incongruous addition, disrupting the visual rhythm of the group and detracting from the architectural integrity of the host building.
8. For the reasons above, I conclude that the catslide roof and dormer would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the aims of Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009) which seeks to ensure that buildings respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and the character of the area and I also find conflict with the SPD those aims which are set out above.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that the appellant has sought to address the concerns raised by the previous Inspector¹ by removing the two-storey front projection. Whilst the current proposal is more modest in scale, the introduction of a catslide roof and dormer would nonetheless bring forward built form at first-floor level. For the reasons set out above, I find that this would still result in a visually prominent and incongruous addition that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
10. The appellant contends that the proposal would not result in an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties, nor would it give rise to overlooking, overshadowing, or a loss of privacy. Based on the submitted evidence and my observations on site, I find no substantive indication that the development would cause demonstrable harm to the living conditions of adjacent occupiers. However, the absence of such harm and compliance with the relevant development plan policies on these matters is a neutral factor rather than one which weighs positively in favour of the scheme.
11. The lack of objections from interested parties is noted. However, a lack of objection does not equate with a lack of harm.
12. The appellant highlights that the proposal would replace the existing flat-roofed garage with a pitched roof structure. Pitched roofs are generally more sympathetic to the prevailing architectural form, and in some contexts may offer visual enhancement. However, in this instance, the existing garage is modest in scale and not so visually incongruous as to be considered harmful. Its replacement with a pitched roof may offer a limited aesthetic benefit, but this does not outweigh the concerns identified in relation to the overall scale, massing, and design of the proposed extension. Additionally, there is no compelling evidence that these alterations to the pitched roof could not be achieved through a more modest intervention, one which better respects the established character of the area and avoids undue prominence.

¹ Appeal Ref. APP/Z3635/D/22/3291635

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR