



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by A James BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th April 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/25/3375056

Terminal House, Station Approach, Shepperton, Surrey TW17 8AS

- 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 Lipa Fried against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00291/FUL.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side extension to the commercial building as shown on drawing no's: E00; E01; E02; E03; E04; P00; P01 and P02 received 12 June 2025.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Lipa Fried against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the appeal address from the application form. I note that there are multiple buildings under this address and the appeal site relates to Building B to the north-west of the railway line. In my decision, I have referred to the appeal site as Terminal House in line with the stated address on the application form.
4. Since the appeal was lodged the Council adopted the Spelthorne Local Plan 2024-2039/40 on 17 March 2026. The policies in the Spelthorne Local Plan 2024-2039/40 supersede policies from the Spelthorne Core Strategy and policy Development Plan Document (adopted 26 February 2009), which were included in the Council's decision notice. I am required to determine the appeal against the development plan in place at the time of my decision, which I have done.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of 4 Old Charlton Road, 6 Old Charlton Road and 13 Station Road with regard to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Living conditions

6. Terminal House is a long two storey commercial building with a low-profile roof and there is also an existing single storey flat roof garage on the parking area. The proposed development would involve demolishing the garage and the erection of a two-storey side extension which would be partly built on a hardstanding area used

for parking for Terminal House. There appears to be some vegetation to the rear of the site just before the train line and there is a grassland area with mature trees to the east of the site which has an open character.

7. The occupiers of 13 Station Road would likely have an outlook onto the parking area of the appeal site and the adjacent open grassland area with mature trees. The occupiers of 13 Station Road have an outdoor amenity space to the side of the property which is surrounded by a wall, gates and some vegetation. Terminal House is situated diagonally across the road from 13 Station Road. Thus, the occupiers of 13 station Road experience a high degree of privacy and good level of outlook.
8. The proposed extension would be directly opposite the private outdoor amenity space of 13 Station Road and there would be windows on the first floor which would likely directly overlook the outdoor amenity space of 13 Station Road. This would result in a significantly harmful loss of privacy to 13 Station Road's outdoor amenity space, and this would diminish the enjoyment of that space. I am not satisfied that the distance between 13 Station Road and the appeal site would mitigate the harm I have identified. Furthermore, the proposed development would reduce the open outlook currently experienced by the occupiers of 13 Station Road. While I accept this would be minor it still adds to the harm I have identified. Consequently, when all is considered, the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 13 Station Road.
9. With regards to 6 Old Charlton Road, the property is attached to 4 Old Charlton Road which means it has very little outlook onto Terminal House. 6 Old Charlton Road's rear outdoor amenity space is positioned adjacent to the existing parking area and the part of the Terminal House with no windows and a garage door. Thus, 6 Old Charlton Road's rear outdoor amenity space has a good degree of privacy.
10. I am not satisfied that the proposed extension would materially alter the outlook or compromise the privacy of the occupiers when they are in their property. However, the proposed development would add a number of first floor windows which would look directly onto the rear outdoor amenity space of 6 Old Charlton Road, diminishing the privacy experienced by the occupiers. Thus, the proposed extension would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of 6 Old Charlton Road. I am not satisfied that the distance between rear garden of 6 Old Charlton Road and the proposed extension would negate the harm I have identified.
11. The position of the dwellinghouse and outdoor amenity space of 4 Old Charlton Road is in line with Terminal House. The proposed extension would be sited past 4 Old Charlton Road and its outdoor amenity space. Therefore, I am not satisfied that the proposed extension would materially change the outlook or privacy currently experienced by the occupiers of 4 Old Charlton Road. The proposed extension would not have a harmful impact on the living conditions of 4 Old Charlton Road. However, this does not diminish the harm I have identified in relation to the existing occupiers of 13 Station Road and 6 Old Charlton Road.
12. In conclusion, the proposed extension would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of 13 Station Road and 6 Old Charlton Road. Thus, the proposed extension would not comply with the provisions set out in policy PS2 of Spelthorne

Local Plan 2024- 2039/40 on (adopted on 17 March 2026). This policy seeks to protect living conditions through securing a high standard in the design.

Other Matters

13. Reference has been made to an increase in noise and disturbance. No policies have been submitted with regard to this matter. The evidence indicates that Environmental Health officers have not raised an objection to this scheme in terms of noise and disturbance. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that the proposal would cause harm with regards to noise and disturbance. Therefore, this matter carries neutral weight in my decision.
14. Reference has been made to parking, access arrangements and highway safety. No policies have been submitted with regard to this matter. The evidence indicates that the Local Highways Authority have not raised an objection. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that the proposal would cause severe harm with regards to Highway Safety or parking stress. Therefore, this matter carries neutral weight in my decision.
15. The appellant has indicated that the proposed development would make a positive contribution to the character of the area. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have found in relation to living conditions.
16. I acknowledge that that the scheme was originally recommended for approval by officers of the Council and that their recommendation was overturned by members of the planning committee. Members are not bound by the recommendation of officers and are entitled to come to a different view. In any case, I have considered this appeal based on the evidence before me, including the submitted plans. This matter has not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issues.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

A James

INSPECTOR