



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2025

By Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3373467

14 Furzewood, Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 6SJ

- 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 Samit Shah against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00856/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as “Proposed rear single storey and side double storey extension, front open porch and alterations to fenestration”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the streetscene and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two storey detached dwelling that faces onto Furzewood at the end next to the junction with Pine Wood. It is acknowledged that the materials used in the development would match those of the existing property with appropriate roof pitches. A suitable gap would be retained from the enlarged dwelling to the side boundary preventing a cramped appearance. There is some variation in Furzewood with regard to matters such as house type and roof form, as well as the building line. The dwelling at the appeal site has a gable ended form and is in the widest plot on this side of the street, while the front elevation is longer than most properties in Furzewood.
4. However, despite these matters, the proposed development would introduce a front two storey gable at the end of the dwelling furthest from Pine Wood. The Appellant identifies examples of dwellings where such features are found and I have considered the submitted photographs. However, these examples are in Pine Wood, which is a separate road. The proposed gable would face directly onto Furzewood next to the adjacent property in this street. In consequence, the enlarged dwelling would be most readily appreciated in the context of nearby dwellings in Furzewood. Rather than adding visual interest, the new front gable would be a particularly unusual and incongruous presence unduly at odds with the appearance of other properties in the street.
5. It would also be an unduly bulky feature with its ridge at the same height as that of the extended main roof. Detached dwellings and pairs of properties in Furzewood

generally have a fairly symmetrical profile above ground floor level. However, the front gable projection would be located at the end of the extended dwelling giving a highly asymmetrical and unbalanced appearance. Moreover, the enlarged dwelling would be one of the closest to the street on this side of Furzewood at first floor level, with the gable also projecting fairly modestly forward of the existing dwelling at this height. These factors would serve to further emphasise the visually obtrusive appearance and undue dominance of the addition.

6. The existing single storey angled garage projects fairly close to the street. However, this has a relatively low flat roof so that it is not overly dominant and would not significantly mitigate the visual impact of the noticeably more imposing gable feature. Rather than appearing awkward, it suitably reflects a similar feature on the other side of the street at the opposite end of Furzewood.
7. For these reasons, it is concluded that the streetscene and the character and appearance of the locality would be harmed. Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document, February 2009, Policy EN1, among other things, intends that proposals should create attractive buildings that respect and make a positive contribution to the streetscene and the character of the area. In this instance the extended dwelling would fail to achieve these aims for the reasons given.
8. In the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development, April 2011, it is indicated that extensions should not over dominate the host building, as would occur in this instance. It is also stated that whilst in some cases an extension to the side or rear can be fully integrated to appear as part of the original building, in most cases this cannot be achieved or may be inappropriate. In this case the proposed gable would be neither subordinate nor satisfactorily integrated for the reasons given.
9. In the National Planning Policy Framework it is indicated that decisions should ensure that developments satisfy a number of considerations. These include that the proposed development should add to the overall quality of the area, as well as being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character, which would not be achieved in this case.
10. In this instance the more efficient use of land and the improved accommodation for the Appellant's family would be achieved at the unacceptable expense of the quality of the built environment. Taking account of all other matters raised, because of the harm that would arise the appeal is dismissed.

M Evans

INSPECTOR