
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2026

by **P Terceiro BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/25/3375469

116-118 Pavilion Gardens, Staines-upon-Thames, Surrey TW18 1HW

- 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 and Mrs R Akano against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00617/FUL.
 - The development proposed is 2no. attached dwellings and extensions / alterations to existing dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. It is clear from the evidence that the proposal pertains to both Nos 116 and 118 Pavilion Gardens. As such, in the interests of clarity, I have used the site address provided in the Council's decision notice on the banner heading above, which has been relied upon by the appellant in their appeal form.
3. The Council has referred to policies within the draft Spelthorne Local Plan 2022 – 2037. I note that the draft plan is at Examination, and the Council expects to adopt it in early 2026, subject to the plan being found sound by the Inspector. Although the draft plan is at an advanced stage, at the current time it does not form part of the statutory development plan, and I have not been made aware as to whether there are any unresolved objections in relation to the cited policies. I therefore attach limited weight to those policies in my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a pair of semi-detached houses located within a predominantly residential road. The two-storey houses have a gable roof and a single storey flat roofed element attached to their side elevations. The appeal dwellings form part of a group of pairs of semi-detached dwellings of a similar design and materials. Even though many of these dwellings have been extended, the pairs of semi-detached dwellings have generous gaps between their side elevations, and sit within wide plots. The dwellings have legible frontages and follow a similar building line, set back from the road with gardens and parking to the road frontage.

6. The dwellings on the opposite side of Pavillion Gardens are also predominantly semi-detached and are accommodated within plots of a similar width. These two-storey properties display a similar form, including hipped roofs and front gables, but feature different decorative elements. Overall, the vicinity of the appeal site is typically characterised by coherent groups of semi-detached dwellings, which is a key contributor of the character of the locale.
7. The proposal would introduce two new attached dwellings on both sides of the appeal dwellings, which would have the appearance of a proportionate two-storey extension with side entrances as main doors. However, the multiple driveways and associated access points onto the road would strongly indicate the terraced nature of the dwellings. Therefore, the proposal would appear incongruous, markedly at odds with its surrounding context.
8. I have not been directed to any adopted guidance which sets out plot width standards, and therefore this assessment is a matter of planning judgement. The proposed plot-subdivision would result in narrower plots than the prevailing plot width in the neighbouring properties along the side Pavillion Gardens where the site lies within. While appropriate gaps would remain to the side elevations of neighbouring properties, the narrower plots, together with the terraced nature of the proposed dwellings, would result in an unduly intense form of development that would appear cramped and at odds with the prevailing rhythm of the street scene.
9. The evidence indicates that the resulting density would be acceptable and appropriate materials could be secured by condition, were I minded allowing the appeal. However, these satisfactory aspects of the scheme would not address nor override the unsympathetic elements as identified above.
10. Thus, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 (DPD). This policy requires a high standard of design and layout and supports development that respects and makes a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated.

Planning Balance

11. The Council accepts that, following a recent appeal decision, it can demonstrate 2.35 to 2.4 years supply of deliverable housing sites. This is not disputed by the appellant. In such circumstances, paragraph 11 d) ii of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
12. Whilst the proposal would be acceptable in relation to other aspects, including living conditions of adjoining neighbours and parking, the absence of harm is a neutral factor that does not weigh in favour or against the proposal.
13. In terms of benefits, the proposal would make an efficient use of land. It would contribute to boosting the supply of housing by providing two new dwellings in an urban area, close to local services and transport links. There would be associated economic benefits during construction of the homes and related employment for its duration, as well as future occupiers spending in the local economy. Owing to the

Council's housing land supply position, these benefits attract considerable weight in favour of the appeal scheme.

14. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area for the reasons outlined above. That harm would be long lasting, and it therefore attracts substantial weight against the proposal. The Framework seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment. Therefore, the conflict between the proposal and DPD Policy EN1 should be given significant weight in this appeal.
15. Taking the above into account, I find that the substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. As a result, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

16. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

P Terceiro

INSPECTOR