



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

by H Miles BA (hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 DECEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/25/3372926

4-5 Broadway, Kingston Road, Staines, Middlesex TW18 1AT

- 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 Asif Iqbal against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01158/FUL.
 - The development proposed is extensions to 2 existing flats at first floor level. Extensions to 2 existing flats at second floor level, together with the formation of a third floor at existing roof level to be incorporated with the proposed second floor flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The Broadway is a three storey terrace with a shopping parade at ground floor and residential above. The block is broadly U shaped so at the ends of the terrace the building turns the corner, this is part of The Broadway's layout and does not appear as additions projecting beyond the first floor building line. There is a 'dummy' pitched roof to the frontage, with a flat roof behind. Many of the properties, including the host building, have substantial ground floor rear extensions. However, extensions at first floor and above are very limited. The elevations to the rear are somewhat functional and details such as fenestration, painting and minor additions including pipework and satellite dishes vary. Nevertheless, the prevailing character and massing to the rear is that the residential properties appear mainly unextended. Overall, the uniformity and modest scale above ground floor level results in subservient bulk and a coherent appearance in this location.
4. The proposed development would introduce an extension at first, second and roof level resulting in a four storey projection to the rear of the host property. It would occupy the full width of the plot with a series of pitched and flat roofs stepping in from the boundaries at second and third floor as well as balconies and Juliet balconies.
5. The combination of multiple flat roofs and pitched mansard style roofs would harmfully contrast with the existing simple and coherent rear elevations above ground floor resulting in a discordant appearance to these additions. Moreover, the

extension would introduce significant bulk to upper floors which is unacceptably at odds with the consistent and modest form of the building. The proposed development would therefore not have suitable regard to the locality and would be a dominant addition which would be overly large, bulky and visually jarring in this context.

6. The rear of the properties are only visible in glimpsed public views from the road. However, the extensions and particularly the upper floors would be seen by the neighbouring occupiers, both from the properties in Gordon Close which are some distance away, but also from The Broadway.
7. Consequently, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009) which requires a high standard of design from new development and sets criteria to achieve this.

Other Matters

8. The flats are in an accessible location within an existing settlement and the proposed development would increase the size of these units as well as providing private amenity space. This would improve the living conditions for the occupiers of these four flats. However, the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and therefore the public and permanent harm to the character and appearance of the area would outweigh the improved living conditions to the occupiers of these four units.
9. Amendments were made to the proposed development during the planning application process, in response to discussions with officers and this decision is based on the plans that were before the Council when they made their decision.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. As such, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles

INSPECTOR