
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2026

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/25/3374005

48 Courtfield Road, Ashford, Surrey TW15 1JR

- 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 Richard Edward Coppen against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00906/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective application for the erection of a rear conservatory'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'the erection of a rear conservatory' at 48 Courtfield Road, Ashford, Surrey TW15 1JR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00906/HOU, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, YSG/48/2025/A and YSG/48/2025/B.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application form indicates that the development applied has been completed and I saw a conservatory present at my visit. Nevertheless and for the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the development shown on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. For terraced dwellings such as the appeal property, the Council's Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011 ('the SPD') advises that single-storey rear extensions up to 3m in depth are usually acceptable subject to appropriate design and materials.
5. The appeal dwelling already has a single-storey rear extension which the Council indicates was approved with a depth of 6m, but which is shown as being 5.5m deep on the submitted plans. In either case, the addition of the conservatory now proposed beyond this projection would result in a cumulative depth of extensions far in excess of the guideline in the SPD.

6. That said, while there would be a roof overhang, the footprint of the conservatory would not project significantly beyond the rear of an existing garage outbuilding to the side of the dwelling. Although the proposal would result in extensions of greater depth than any that I observed nearby, it would not therefore notably increase the total depth of development on the appeal site over the existing situation.
7. In addition, the very modest height of the conservatory and its relatively limited width with notable set ins from the existing extension which is itself of modest height would moderate the overall scale of development on the site. The predominantly glazed elevations would further reduce the physical presence of the conservatory, and despite their total depth, the extensions would in my judgement remain clearly subordinate to the two-storey host dwelling.
8. Moreover, the extensions together with the garage outbuilding and a further outbuilding at the rear of the site would leave a fairly small area of garden. However, there is significant variation in the shapes and sizes of gardens to nearby dwellings on this side of Courtfield Road, and I saw varied outbuildings present within many of the spaces so that I did not discern a strongly open character or regular pattern to the rear of dwellings. The surrounding context further includes a yard with outbuildings to the rear of the appeal site and a petrol filling station beyond, both of which predominantly comprise areas of hardstanding or built form.
9. The SPD advises that very large rear extensions may result in the scale of extended houses being out of character with their locality. In this case, the conservatory would not be readily appreciable from the street scene and while it would be apparent in views from neighbouring properties, the above factors mean that it would not cause harmful disruption of any existing characteristic pattern. I further find having regard to the specific circumstances of the appeal site and proposal, including the varied surroundings, that the degree of built form would not appear unduly dominant or excessive and the area of the remaining garden would not stand out as conspicuous or discordant. Accordingly, a departure from the SPD's detailed guidance on the depth of extensions is justified.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or area and I find no conflict with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 which broadly requires development to respect and make a positive contribution to the character of the area in which it is situated. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it seeks developments that are visually attractive, sympathetic to local character and that establish or maintain a strong sense of place.

Other Matters

11. Despite its depth relative to the neighbouring dwellings, I am satisfied that the very modest height of the conservatory and its set in from the boundaries would ensure there would not be a harmful loss of light or outlook for neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR