



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3370326

4 The Vale, Sunbury-On-Thames, TW16 7SD

- 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 Dorjan Hyseni against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00677/HOU.
 - The development is "Single storey rear extension (3m addition to approved application 25/00116/HOU) and addition of window to ground floor rear elevation (in the kitchen area).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property (No.3), with particular regard to light and overbearing impact.

Reasons

3. Planning permission has been granted for a single-storey rear extension and two-storey side and rear extension (Council reference 25/00116/HOU). This proposal seeks to extend the single-storey rear element to a total depth of 6m.
4. The proposed extension would extend along the shared boundary with No.3. The neighbouring property is a mid-terrace, and its neighbour to the other side has a single-storey rear extension. This extends to a similar depth as that already permitted for the appeal property, and which reflects the advice in the Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which indicates single-storey extensions up to 3 metres on terraced properties, subject to appropriate design, are normally acceptable. The proposal would be double this depth.
5. While acknowledging that permitted development rights potentially allow for deeper extensions, these require prior approval. Consideration as to whether the development would meet all of the conditions of Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 is not a matter before me, and therefore, I have not given this weight as a fallback.
6. The extension would, in part, be screened by boundary fencing, although there is no mature landscaping as suggested by the appellant. Due to its considerable length and proximity to the boundary, the presence of the new flank wall would

visually dominate the outlook. No. 3 is limited in width, and the projection of the extension would significantly increase the sense of enclosure for the occupants. Sited to the southwest, there would also be some loss of sunlight to the rear of No.3 later in the day, especially during winter months when the sun is lower in the sky. The loss of natural light would exacerbate the visual impact of the proposal to the extent that it would feel oppressive to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

7. The appellant has referred to two appeal decisions for extensions of a similar depth. The specific details of these cases are not before me; however, one refers to the neighbouring property also having an extension, and the other relates to a semi-detached property. As such, they are not directly comparable; the context is different, and each proposal must be assessed on its own merits.
8. In conclusion, I find that the single-storey rear extension would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at No.3 The Vale. Thus the proposed development would be contrary to the advice in the Council's SPD and policies EN1 of the Spelthorne Development Plan Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, which, amongst other things, require high quality design, and to achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties, avoiding a significant harmful impact, including an overbearing effect due to bulk and proximity or outlook.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR