

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3374969

12 Dudley Road, Ashford, TW15 2LF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Daniel Moore against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Reference is 25/01010/HOU.
 - The development proposed the erection of part two-storey, part single storey rear extension and rear facing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace two storey home on a road of established residential character. The layout, the varied types of homes, the spaces and the gardens all come together to form a streetscene of pleasing appearance albeit the appeal property's bulky front facing dormer does unfortunately intrude. The proposal is as described above.
 4. I would agree with the Council that the part two storey, part single storey rear extension would, as an overall entity, accord with applicable planning policy and represent acceptable development.
 5. Turning to the rear facing dormer, I would deem that its box-like form, large scale, rather random windows, and position at ridge height, close to the sides of the roof and the eaves, would lead to a regrettable radical change to, and expansion of, the roof form. Unfortunately, this dormer would be patently at odds architecturally and out of scale with the structure below. It would also undesirably appear as markedly at variance from the terraced dwellings alongside. Overall, the ungainly dormer and the increased scale of dwelling as whole at upper level would look 'top-heavy', alien, and be jarring on the eye. Regrettably, it would stand out as a poorly designed form of extension. It would sit most uncomfortably above the other proposed, architecturally varied,
-

works. Whether or not development has widespread vantage points there is a justified planning requirement to achieve good design.

6. Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (February 2009) seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure new development embodies high quality design, with suitable proportions and layout, reflective of context and protective of local character. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with this policy. The policy has objectives that are also reflected in the Council's *Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document* (April 2011). I conclude that the scheme would also run contrary to this document and its pertinent 'dormer' guidance albeit I fully recognise that this publication cannot be expected to cover every eventuality.

Other matters

7. I am aware of the planning history on this site. This includes Council reference 25/00192/CPD Certificate of Lawfulness for the proposed conversion of the existing garage into habitable accommodation and the installation of a rear facing dormer, granted on 10 April 2025. As well as ref 25/00305/HOU: Erection of a first floor rear extension granted 29 April 2025 and 25/00693/PDH: Prior approval notification for a single storey rear extension granted 3 July 2025. I note the Appellant's 'fall-back' argument. However, the schemes would not be able to be constructed together under the above references and relevant legislation; and I am dealing with the entity of the appeal proposal, looking at matters as a whole, and working in the context of applicable planning policies. The appeal scheme's rear facing dormer would not represent good design and consequently I could not condone this proposal.
8. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
9. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR