
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: 25 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/25/3375194

Enterprise House, 203 London Road, Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4HR

- 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 Access Self-Storage against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00268/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing building and redevelopment of site to create a building arranged over ground, first, second, part third and part fourth floors for Class E(g)(i)(office) and Class B8 (self-storage) uses, provision of car and cycle parking, landscaping, plant and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the site address above from the decision notice as it more accurately describes the site location.
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. London Road (A30) in this location accommodates development in varied uses, including commercial buildings of a large scale and pockets of residential development. The commercial buildings range in height from single to five-storey, typically with a functional and utilitarian design. The front elevations of the buildings on the same side of the A30 as the appeal site normally run parallel to this road.
6. The appeal site comprises an office building and associated multi-level car park to the rear. The detached building is three storeys in height, with a four-storey core to

the rear and a two-storey element with canopy to the road frontage. The locally listed Northeast Surrey Short Stay School shares a boundary with the appeal site.

7. The appeal scheme seeks to construct a detached commercial building that would be set over five storeys. Even though the top floor would be set back from the front elevation, because of its overall height, together with its significant width and depth, the replacement building would be substantial in terms of its mass and scale. Consequently, the proposed development would loom over the nearby buildings on the same side of London Road and would appear unduly conspicuous within the locality. Its uncharacteristic height and large scale would therefore fail to integrate harmoniously with the local townscape.
8. The proposed building would sit on an angle to the A30 and, consequently, its south-eastern corner would be placed very close to the highway, noticeably further forward than the front elevation of the adjoining self-storage building. While the proposed alignment to the street would follow that of the main body of the existing building, the existing front element is two storeys in height closer to the A30. By contrast, the proposal would be much taller and bulkier to the road frontage. Thus, the siting, scale and height of the proposal would result in a poor visual relationship with the adjoining self-storage building and would appear obtrusive in views from the east along London Road.
9. While the set-back of the rear wing would provide articulation to the proposal's west elevation, the substantial scale of the building would appear jarring and disconnected from its surroundings in views from the west along London Road.
10. Due to its varied nature and lack of homogeneity in style, the streetscape is tolerable to new design. However, as proposed the scheme would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the surrounding development, it would not be successful in its proposed form.
11. The proposed plans show that an area of soft-landscaping, including new trees, would be provided within the frontage of the site. However, it is unlikely that planting could achieve a successful assimilation of such a large structure into the street scene, even more so when considering the time it would take for planting to fully establish to soften the impact.
12. The design and materials of the proposed building would be appropriate for its use. In addition, the highways Technical Note supplied by the appellant demonstrated that self-storage facilities generate little vehicle movement, and therefore the parking provision would be adequate to serve the proposal. However, this would not justify the harm the proposal would cause to the character of the area.
13. For these reasons, the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009, which amongst other things supports development that respects and makes a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which it is situated, paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions and building lines of adjoining buildings.

Other Matters

14. Reference is made to a planning permission granted¹ by the Council for the re-development of 193 London Road, adjacent to the site. However, the Council indicates that this development has not been constructed, nor do I have any compelling evidence to suggest when it may be forthcoming. As such, I have assessed the appeal scheme in the context of the existing situation.
15. The appellant refers to some policies of the London Plan. However, the Council has confirmed that this plan is not applicable to Spelthorne. As such, I do not find these policies to be relevant in the context of this appeal.

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

¹ LPA Ref: 23/01524/FUL