



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3370765

202 Kingston Road, Staines-upon-Thames, Surrey TW18 1PE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Erald Meziu against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00507/PDH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 6m rear extension following the demolition of the existing conservatory and garage/storage.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters & Main Issue

3. 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. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. However, I am satisfied it is sufficiently accurate to be used above and neither main parties would be prejudiced by my doing so.
4. The above-mentioned legislation (GPDO) grants planning permission for the enlargement of a dwelling subject to limitations and conditions. The Council has not explicitly confirmed that the proposal would be development permitted thereunder, but I have no reason to find that it would not be compliant with the description of permitted development, and some prior approval matters as set out by the above class, given the reason they refused the original submission. With this and the above in mind, I have focussed on the effect of the scheme on the amenity (living conditions of occupiers) of Number 204 Kingston Road (No 204). This is the main issue of the appeal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a semi-detached dwelling which appears relatively unaltered but has some recent unimplemented planning history including a rear extension. No 204 also appears relatively unaltered to the rear with a set of bi-folding doors at the ground floor. The appeal proposal would span the width of the rear elevation of the building extending into the long and otherwise unincumbered garden.

6. The appeal proposal, by virtue of its extended length and height along with its siting against the shared boundary of No 204, would result in a sheer blank elevation viewed by occupiers from within the building. Notwithstanding the solid wall boundary treatment, the proposal would extend above it significantly and the full effect would be felt. Moreover, the combination of this substantial extension with the surrounding context would result in a tunnelling effect to the view out of the rear bi-folding doors. This would result in unacceptable harm to the occupiers' outlook from within the property. Moreover, and also due to its length, it would loom over the patio space affecting the outlook of the users thereof unacceptably.
7. The garage/storage structure on the alternate side elevation of the dwelling extends in further than the proposal. However, as viewed on site, it appears to be partially removed. Nonetheless, its height is noticeably lower than appeal proposal and would not be comparable. Moreover, and with regard to the previously approved planning permission, I understand that its height and design has some similarities. However, the increased depth would be considerably greater and for the reasons given above would amount to unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 204. Therefore, I cannot give any more than limited weight to the given fallback position.
8. The proposal would conflict with Paragraph A.4(7) of Class A, Part 1 of the GPDO which relates to the impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises. The Council and third parties have drawn my attention to development plan policies and additional guidance that seek to ensure proposals are of a high-quality design and amenity standard. Whilst these are a material consideration for permitted development schemes, they are not decisive. Albeit, for the above reasons, the appeal proposal would not sit squarely with their aims.

Other Matter

9. This scheme is to be considered on amenity only following a site-specific assessment thereof. Other examples given by the appellant may provide context but would not, in this particular case, change the outcome of the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given, the scheme would not be granted prior approval as it would be assessed under the above-mentioned class of the legislation. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR