
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2026

by K Craddock BA (Hons) MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/25/3371936

Franklin House, Station Approach, SHEPPERTON TW17 8AR

- 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 25/00206/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front extension and the addition of a new floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

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

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development taken from the planning application form is as above. However, for purposes of clarity, I refer to it in my decision as the addition of a second floor, three storey front extension, creation of an entrance canopy, cycle storage facilities, with associated parking and landscaping.
4. The Council adopted its Local Plan on 17 March 2026. My decision is based on these policies as the up-to-date development plan. The appellant has been invited to comment on the adopted policies as part of the appeal process and I am satisfied neither party has been prejudiced.
5. The Council has drawn my attention to a number of policies which it considers to be relevant; however, I have taken these into account only insofar as they are determinative in this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

7. The appeal site is situated close to the centre of Shepperton Village, which is characterised by a busy crossroads at the heart of a mixed use area. A range of commercial and residential uses front onto the four roads that converge at the junction: Old Charlton Road and High Street sit on an approximate north-south axis, with Green Lane and Laleham Road intersecting them on an approximate

east-west axis. The four roads are wide and, in places, include tree-lined planting, particularly along High Street, and parking. Building heights are consistently two and three storeys high comprising a variety of architectural styles, details and features.

8. The appeal site, Franklin House, is located within the north-east quadrant between Old Charlton Road and Green Lane, on a prominent plot that it shares with Terminal House. Terminal House is a two and three storey commercial building that stands to the side of the appeal site as well as comprising a separate two storey building located to the rear of the appeal site. The two buildings that form Terminal House are joined by an enclosed pedestrian walkway that bridges the railway.
9. The other three quadrants, where the crossroads intersect, contain development that has been designed to address the corner location, displaying an increase in height with additional detailing, such as curved façades, balconies or architectural features. This emphasises the importance of the corner locations as wayfinding features and enhances their legibility as buildings that front onto a key location and spacious environment. This creates a sense of arrival and destination, which is a positive feature in the character of the area.
10. Out of the four corner plots fronting the crossroads, the appeal site currently possesses the weakest street presence. Both Franklin House and Terminal House face away from the corner and do not present a strong, legible frontage or contribute positively to creating a sense of destination in the way the other three corner plots do. The appeal site has the scope to accommodate a three storey building that addresses the public space and creates a landmark, reflecting the pattern of development on the remaining corner plots, subject to a design and appearance that has a positive effect on the character and appearance of the area.
11. However, the proposal remains very much bound by the architectural style, appearance and materials of the existing building, which are more suited to a building of the current scale rather than the development as proposed. At its current scale, the appearance of the building suits its brick and tile construction, the rhythm of fenestration and the proportion of hung tiles to brickwork on the elevations. If the size and form of the building were to be increased as proposed, it would have the visual effect of elongating and distorting the height of the building, which would cause it to appear disproportionate. This would result in a harmful addition to the streetscene.
12. In addition, all four corner plots facing towards the crossroads contain space in front of the buildings, which is a defining feature of the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would place enclosed cycle storage in this space, which would interrupt the pattern of development and continuity of space that frames the crossroads. This would represent a prominent and incongruous feature that would be at odds with the spacious, set back frontages that characterises the pattern of development around the crossroads. This would be exacerbated by the clear lines of sight from multiple directions along the crossroads.
13. Policy PS2 requires a high standard in the design and layout of new development. In particular, it seeks for the creation of attractive buildings and places with their own identity to make a positive contribution to the streetscene and character of the

area, whilst paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines and materials including those of adjoining buildings. The proposal would fail to meet the expectations of this policy.

14. For the above reasons I conclude that the proposed development would not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policy PS2 of the Spelthorne Borough Council Local Plan (2026) which, amongst other things, seeks to achieve a high standard of design and layout in new development, create attractive buildings and make a positive contribution to the streetscene and character of the area.

Other Matters

15. I note the third party concerns about potential future uses of the building or the site. However, these do not form part of the appeal proposals and I can only determine the appeal based on the evidence before me.
16. I have had regard to the additional matters raised in the representations including the planning history of the site, parking/highways, drawings, public services, disturbance, fire safety and the appellant's communication with the existing businesses operating from the appeal site. None of the matters raised would warrant coming to a different conclusion.
17. I note that the appellant has raised concerns with the conduct of the Council, however, this is a matter that would be dealt with through the Council's complaints procedure and is not a matter for this appeal.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, the proposed development does not accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations that indicate I should take a decision other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

K Craddock

INSPECTOR