

Planning Committee

09 December 2025



Application No.	25/01171/HOU
Site Address	14 Springfield Grove, Sunbury-on-Thames, TW16 6NT
Applicant	Katie Hayes
Proposal	Erection of a part single-storey rear and part two-storey rear extension. Following removal of existing single-storey rear extension.
Case Officer	Emily Archibald
Ward	Halliford and Sunbury West
Called-in	Simon Rowberry, Interim Planning Manager, is exercising his delegated authority to refer the application to the Planning Committee because the proposal is considered finely balanced.

Application Dates	Valid:24.09.2025	Expiry: 19.11.2025	Target: Extension of Time agreed until 11.12.2025
Executive Summary	<p>The application site relates to 14 Springfield Grove in Sunbury-on-Thames; a two-storey mid terrace dwelling situated on the northern side of the road. The property has been previously extended via a single storey-rear extension, though otherwise remains original.</p> <p>The property, along with the rest of the terrace, is Locally Listed. It forms part of a row of six cottages dating from the mid-18th century, with a central decorative feature displaying the name "Springfield." The cottages are built from amber brick over two storeys and were originally used as almshouses, with later changes made to the end sections.</p> <p>The applicant seeks permission for a part single-storey and part two-storey extension to the rear of the terraced property.</p> <p>It is considered that the application is acceptable in terms of character, design, and amenity. It is also considered that it will have an acceptable impact on the design and appearance of the Locally Listed terrace.</p>		
Recommended Decision	Approve the application subject to conditions as set out in Paragraph 8 of the Report.		

MAIN REPORT

1. Development Plan

- 1.1 The following policies in the Council's Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 are considered relevant to this proposal:
 - EN1 Design of New Development
 - EN5 Buildings of Architectural and Historic Interest
- 1.2 Also relevant are the following Supplementary Planning Documents/Guidance:
 - SPD on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development 2011
- 1.3 The policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024) are also relevant.
- 1.4 On 19 May 2022, the Council agreed that the draft Spelthorne Local Plan 2022 – 2037 be published for public consultation under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). The public consultation for the Pre-Submission Publication version of the Local Plan ended on 21st September 2022 and the local plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 25th November 2022.
- 1.5 An Examination into the emerging Local Plan commenced on 23 May 2023. However, it was paused to allow time for the new council to understand and review the policies and implications of the emerging Local Plan and to address the issues that were identified in the first week of the Examination, in particular flood risk and its potential implications in relation to the site allocation and delivery strategy of the plan.
- 1.6 The Examination Hearings reopened in January 2025 and closed on 18 February 2025. The six-week public consultation on the Main Modifications to the Spelthorne Local Plan was closed on 15 May 2025. The Council are expecting the Inspector's report imminently.
- 1.7 Adoption of the Local Plan by Council could be by December 2025 subject to the plan being found sound by the Inspector.
- 1.8 Adoption of the Local Plan by Council could be by February 2025 subject to the plan being found sound by the Inspector.
(<https://spelthornelocalplan.info/evidence-base/>)
- 1.9 The following policies of the Pre-Submission Spelthorne Local Plan 2022 – 2037 are of relevance :
 - PS2: Designing places and spaces

1.10 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policy states at para 49 that: Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

1.11 Section 38(6) the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan (unless material considerations indicate otherwise) and not in accordance with an emerging plan, although emerging policies may be a material consideration.

1.12 At this stage, the policies in the Pre-Submission Spelthorne Local Plan carry limited weight in the decision-making process. The adopted policies in the 2009 Core Strategy and Policies DPD carry substantial weight in the determination of this planning application

2. Relevant Planning History

2.1 The site has the following planning history:

PLAN E/FUL/83/721	Erection of a part single, part two-storey rear extension, measuring 15 ft. 5 ins. (4.7 m) by 18 ft. 10 ins. (5.7 m) at ground floor level and 8 ft. (2.4 m) by 9 ft. 7 ins. (2.9 m) at first floor level, to provide a kitchen, dining room, bathroom and bedroom.	Granted 19.10.1983
01/00496/FUL	Erection of a part two storey part single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension	Granted 06.09.2001
06/00812/FUL	Erection of a part two storey part single storey rear extension.	Granted 09.11.2006

2.2 It is relevant to note than none of the above applications have been implemented.

3. Description of Current Proposal

3.1 The application property is a mid-terraced two-storey dwelling, forming part of the Locally Listed Springfield Cottages. (6-16 Springfield Grove) The property

has been previously extended via a single-storey rear extension, though otherwise remains original.

- 3.2 Springfield Cottages comprise a row of six mid-18th-century homes, distinguished by a central decorative panel bearing the name “Springfield.” Built from amber brick and arranged over two storeys, they were originally constructed as almshouses. The roof is clad in old tiles and features prominent chimney stacks. Additional architectural details include a brick band at first-floor height, traditional sash windows, and arched ground-floor window heads.
- 3.3 The application under consideration is seeking permission for the erection of a part single-storey rear extension with rooflights, and part two-storey rear extension. Following removal of existing single storey rear extension.
- 3.4 The proposed ground-floor extension will have a depth of 5.8 metres, with a pitched roof and lowered eaves height of 2.8 metres. This matches the depth of No. 12’s ground-floor rear extension. The two-storey extension above will project 2.9 metres, aligning with the depth of No. 12’s two-storey rear extension, and will also feature a pitched roof that ties into the main roof of the original dwelling. At first-floor level, the extension will project 1.5 metres beyond the first-floor rear elevation of No. 16.
- 3.5 It is important to note that two revisions to the scheme have been received. The first revision sets the two-storey extension back 40cm. The second revision brought the eaves height down to match the eaves of No. 16 adjacent.
- 3.6 It is also relevant to note that the proposed extensions consist of a two-storey rear extension and a single-storey rear extension. The description had previously referred to a part–ground-floor, part–first-floor rear extension; although this is largely a matter of semantics, the description has been updated accordingly. This change is not considered to prejudice neighbouring properties, as telephone conversations have been had with the occupants on both sides, who are aware of the proposals and have viewed the plans online.
- 3.7 The full set of proposed plans are provided as an Appendix.

4. Consultations

- 4.1 The following table shows those bodies consulted and their response.

Non-Statutory Consultees:

Consultee	Comment
Heritage Advisor	No objection.
Environmental Health	Informative recommended to manage asbestos.

5. Public Consultation

- 5.1 A total of three neighbouring properties were notified of the planning application.
- 5.2 A total of 3 letters of representation (2 from the same address) have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:
- Loss of light & overshadowing
 - Overbearing impact
 - Loss of privacy
 - Impact on heritage and character
 - Impact on wider character of the area
 - Impact on wellbeing and quality of life
 - Bulky and disproportionate scale

6. Planning Issues

- Design, Character & Heritage
- Neighbouring Amenity

7. Planning Considerations

Design, Character & Heritage

- 7.1 Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (CS&P DPD) states that the Council will require a high standard in the design and layout of new development. Proposals for new development should demonstrate that they will create buildings and places that are attractive with their own distinct identity, and they should also respect and make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area in which they are situated, paying due regard to the scale, height, proportions, building lines, layout, materials and other characteristics of adjoining buildings and land.
- 7.2 The Council's Design SPD advises that two-storey rear extensions should be designed to appear clearly subordinate to the host dwelling and should incorporate an integrated roof design. It also states that single-storey rear extensions on terraced properties should not exceed three metres in depth or three metres in height close to the boundary.
- 7.3 The two-storey rear extension, which projects 2.9 metres beyond the original rear wall and is set well below the main roof ridge, is considered to be a proportionate addition that integrates appropriately with the existing roof form. The design complies with the Council's guidance by incorporating a pitched roof with an integrated roof design. The set-down from the original roof ridge helps the design to appear subordinate. The extension is also considered to be in character in light of similar developments nearby, including the flat-roofed two-storey addition at the adjoining No. 12, which shares the same depth as the proposed two-storey extension.

- 7.4 Given the extension is located to the rear, the proposal would not affect the street scene or the period character of the front elevation. The extensions have been designed to tie into existing patterns of development and are considered acceptable in this context. Overall, the proposals are considered to respect the built form of the terrace and the surrounding area, providing for modern family living without causing harm to the character of the host dwelling or the wider locality, in accordance with Policy EN1.
- 7.5 The proposed single-storey rear extension, measuring 5.8 metres in depth and 3.9 metres in height with a pitched roof, exceeds the Council's SPD guidance on height and depth. However, several neighbouring properties have constructed rear extensions of similar scale, including the adjoining property at No. 12, which projects to the same depth. Given this established pattern of development, the proposed single-storey element is considered to be in keeping with its surroundings and would not appear unduly dominant within the rear garden environment. The pitched roof design also reflects the form of adjacent single-storey extensions, maintaining a consistent and coherent appearance.
- 7.6 The Council's CS & P DPD, at Policy EN5 states that the Council will seek to preserve its architectural and historic heritage by encouraging the retention of buildings of local architectural or historic interest and seeking to ensure that their character and setting is preserved in development proposals. As has been previously acknowledged, the property is Locally Listed, which requires some extra attention to detail with regards to its design. The application property is part of the mid-18th Century cottages known as Springfield Grove. The cottages are characterised by their period sash windows, amber brickwork and prominent chimney stacks. The Council's Heritage Advisor was consulted on the proposal. He notes that the front elevation will remain unchanged and that there have been numerous alterations to the rear of the terrace. He also notes that the front elevation is mostly what makes up the Local Listing, therefore the fact this isn't changing would mean the proposals have an acceptable impact upon the Locally Listed character. He has no objections to the proposal.
- 7.7 The proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on the character of the host dwelling and the wider area and does not harm the Locally Listed character. It is therefore in accordance with Policy EN1 and EN5 of the CS& P DPD.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 7.8 Policy EN1 states that proposals for new development should demonstrate that they will achieve a satisfactory relationship to adjoining properties, avoiding significant harmful impacts in terms of loss of privacy, daylight or sunlight, or overbearing effect due to bulk and proximity or outlook.
- 7.9 The application site is adjacent to No. 12 Springfield Grove to the east and No. 16 to the west. It also backs onto St. Ignatius RC Church.

- 7.10 With regard to the potential impacts on No. 16, this property is staggered, with its two-storey rear wall projecting approximately 1.3 metres beyond the original rear wall of the application site. It also has a conservatory positioned beyond this, which is adjacent to the shared boundary with the application site. This conservatory connects to another glazed extension adjacent. No. 16 has a wide plot and there is a 2.9m tall boundary wall between the dwellings.
- 7.11 The proposed two-storey extension would extend 2.9m from the rear of the original property. Due to the staggered relationship between No. 16 and the application property, its full depth would not be visible from No. 16; only approximately 1.5 metres extends past the original rear building line of No. 16.
- 7.12 A 45-degree vertical line has been applied from the ground-floor rear-facing windows of No. 16's conservatory. This line would not be breached, as the conservatory projects further than the proposed two-storey extension. The SPD requires the 45-degree line to be taken from the rear building line and does not make any exceptions for conservatories. Therefore, given that No. 16 has extended their property, the guide can reasonably be applied as it would to any other extension, using the rear-facing windows of the conservatory as the reference point. It is acknowledged that the conservatory contains original rear facing windows serving the kitchen. However, as a naturally light-filled space, the limited 1.5-metre projection of the proposed extension is not considered sufficient to cause significant loss of light. This is particularly relevant given that the rear elevations are north-facing, and No. 16's conservatory and adjoining sunroom span approximately 7.6 metres in width, allowing ample light to enter despite the proposed 1.5-metre extension. The kitchen/diner at No. 16 is a large room and also benefits from a secondary opening into the sunroom, and the conservatory itself is extensively glazed, allowing ample natural light to penetrate.
- 7.13 Whilst the proposed two-storey extension abuts the boundary, its modest 1.5-metre depth beyond No. 16 ensures that it would not cause a significant overbearing impact within this terraced context. Furthermore, in response to the Council's request, the applicant reduced the depth of the two-storey extension by 40cm and dropped the eaves height 50cm to match the eaves of No. 16, further reducing its impact.
- 7.14 The Council's SPD acknowledges that some impact from extensions is inevitable. However, in this case, the effects are not considered significantly harmful. While some minor overshadowing may occur at certain times, it would be limited and insufficient to justify refusal, particularly given the conservatory's high levels of natural light, wide plot and the north-facing orientation.
- 7.15 The extensions show no flank windows. The first-floor rear windows are set-in from the boundary, face onto the property's own rear garden and would not directly overlook No. 16's conservatory or garden. Therefore, the proposal is not considered to result in an unacceptable loss of privacy or sense of overlooking.

- 7.16 Although the proposed single-storey rear extension would project 5.8 metres, its full depth would not be fully visible from No. 16 due to the staggered building line. The modest 2.8-metre eaves height and pitched roof design would prevent the extension from appearing overbearing or causing a significant loss of outlook or natural light to the neighbouring conservatory. Additionally, a 2.9-metre-high boundary wall runs the length of the garden between the two properties, largely obscuring the single-storey extension from view. The ground floor element is not considered to result in unacceptable overshadowing, loss of light or overbearing impact.
- 7.17 In terms of the impacts to No. 12 Springfield Grove, it is noted that this property has already been extended by way of a single storey rear extension measuring 5.8 metres in depth. (13/00507/REN) The proposed single storey rear extension would align with this depth and extend no further, thereby ensuring that the ground floor element would not give rise to any harmful impacts in terms of loss of light, outlook or overbearing impact to No. 12's rear facing ground floor windows. No. 12 has been extended via a two-storey rear extension, built up to the shared boundary with the application site. Whilst the true depth of this extension is not confirmed, aerial imagery and historic plans indicate that it measures approximately half the width of the ground floor extension (around 3 metres) which is an almost identical depth to the proposed two-storey extension. As such, the proposal would not result in any unreasonable projection beyond No. 12's two-storey extension. The presence of No. 12's own rear additions would in effect, mitigate any potential impacts in terms of loss of light, outlook or overbearing effect. No flank windows are proposed due to the nature of the development adjoining No. 12's two-storey extension, however rooflights are proposed within the flank roof slopes of the ground floor extension. The rooflights do not provide a natural or direct view into No. 12's rear facing windows, therefore the impacts on privacy will be acceptable.
- 7.18 The two-storey rear extension would retain a 29-metre separation distance from St. Ignatius Church to the rear. This is considered an acceptable distance. Moreover, it is worth noting that the Church is not a residential dwelling, therefore the impacts with regards to overlooking are limited. No. 20 Springfield Grove, although not physically adjoining the site, does sit to the northwest of the application site, and may potentially have a view of the extension. This property is, however, situated 18 metres away, and at an angle, therefore rear facing windows on the proposed two-storey extension are not considered to provide a direct view into No. 20's windows.
- 7.19 The development is considered to have an acceptable impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours and is therefore in accordance with Policy EN1 of the CS & P DPD.

Other Matters

- 7.20 It is important to note that while the recommendation is to approve, the LPA has carefully considered the concerns raised by No. 16 Springfield Grove, including conducting two separate site visits to assess the potential impacts.

Climate Change

- 7.21 The Climate Change Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted by the Council in April 2024. It provides more detailed guidance to applicants on how to implement adopted Policy SP7 from the Core Strategy 2009. Policy SP7 seeks to reduce climate change effects by:
- a) promoting inclusion for renewable energy, energy conservation and waste management in new and existing developments
 - b) development reduces the need to travel and encourages alternatives to car use
 - c) encourage non car-based travel,
 - d) promoting the efficient use and conservation of water resources,
 - e) promoting measures to reduce flooding and the risks from flooding,
 - f) supporting measures to enhance and manage Staines' role as a public transport interchange.
- 7.22 There are also three implementation policies; Policy CC1: Renewable Energy Conservation and sustainable Construction, Policy CC2: Sustainable Travel and Policy CC3: Parking provision.
- 7.23 The scheme is considered to align well with the Council's climate change policies and the SPD. The development makes efficient use of an older property, aiming to modernise it for contemporary living while improving its current energy rating. In addition, the property is located in a sustainable area. For these reasons, the proposal is considered acceptable on sustainability grounds.

Financial Considerations

- 7.24 Under S155 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016, Local Planning Authorities are now required to ensure that potential financial benefits of certain development proposals are made public when a Local Planning Authority is considering whether or not to grant planning permission for planning applications which are being determined by the Council's Planning Committee. A financial benefit must be recorded regardless of whether it is material to the Local Planning Authority's decision on a planning application, but planning officers are required to indicate their opinion as to whether the benefit is material to the application or not.
- 7.25 The proposal would not generate New Homes Bonus, nor is it a CIL chargeable scheme.

Equalities Act 2010

- 7.26 This planning application has been considered in light of the Equality Act 2010 and associated Public Sector Equality Duty, where the Council is

required to have due regard to: (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act; (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

- 7.27 The question in every case is whether the decision maker has in substance had due regard to the relevant statutory need, to see whether the duty has been performed.
- 7.28 The Council's obligation is to have due regard to the need to achieve these goals in making its decisions. Due regard means to have such regard as is appropriate in all the circumstances.
- 7.29 The NPPF defines people with disabilities as individuals that have a physical or mental impairment, which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on their ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. This can include but is not limited to, people with ambulatory difficulties, blindness, learning difficulties, autism and mental health needs. It is considered that it would be possible for individuals with disabilities to access the development.

Human Rights Act 1998

- 7.30 This planning application has been considered against the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998. Under Article 6 the applicants (and those third parties who have made representations) have the right to a fair hearing and to this end full consideration will be given to their comments. Article 8 and Protocol 1 of the First Article confer a right to respect private and family life and a right to the protection of property, i.e. peaceful enjoyment of one's possessions which could include a person's home, and other land and business assets.
- 7.31 In taking account of the Council policy as set out in the Spelthorne Local Plan and the NPPF and all material planning considerations, Officers have concluded on balance that the rights conferred upon the applicant/ objectors/ residents/ other interested party by Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol may be interfered with, since such interference is in accordance with the law and is justified in the public interest. Any restriction of these rights posed by the approval of the application is legitimate since it is proportionate to the wider benefits of such a decision, is based upon the merits of the proposal, and falls within the margin of discretion afforded to the Council under the Town & Country Planning Acts.

Conclusion

- 7.32 Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design, character, and heritage. It represents a suitable enhancement to an older period property, aligns with existing patterns of development, and does not harm the heritage of the locally listed building. The impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties is acceptable. Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable and is therefore recommended for approval.

8. Recommendation

8.1 The options available to the Planning Committee for decision making are:

- To APPROVE the application as set out in the report.

This option is recommended. The report analyses, in detail, the reasons as to why the application is considered acceptable in planning terms.

- To APPROVE the application subject to additional/amended conditions and informatives.

This option is not recommended. The recommended conditions and informatives are set out below. The Planning Committee should be aware of paragraph 57 of the NPPF which states that: *- planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and only imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other aspects.*

- To REFUSE the application.

This option is not recommended. The report assess why Officers consider the application to be acceptable on planning grounds, and there are no [material planning reasons](#) on which the proposal can be refused on.

8.2 The application is recommended for approval, subject to the conditions and informatives below:

APPROVE subject to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: This condition is required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SPFD1-SMART-00-ZZ-DR-A-001 REV P02, and SPFD1-SMART-00-ZZ-DR-A-3001 REV P02, both received 07.10.2025, and SPFD1-SMART-00-ZZ-DR-A-3601 REV P03, received 17.11.2025.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure the development is completed as approved.

3. The extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in facing materials to match those of the existing building in colour and texture.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory external appearance in accordance with policies SP6 and EN1 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

4. That no openings of any kind be formed in the western flank elevation of the two-storey extension hereby permitted without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To safeguard the privacy of the adjoining property(ies) in accordance with policies SP6 and EN1 of the Spelthorne Borough Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009.

INFORMATIVES TO APPLICANT

1. In assessing this application, officers have worked with the applicant in a positive, creative and proactive manner consistent with the requirements of paragraphs 38-41 of the NPPF. This includes the following -
 - a. Provided or made available pre application advice to seek to resolve problems before the application was submitted and to foster the delivery of sustainable development
 - b. Provided feedback through the validation process including information on the website, to correct identified problems to ensure that the application was correct and could be registered
 - c. Have proactively communicated with the applicant through the process to advise progress, timescale or recommendation.
2. Access by the Fire Brigade
Notice of the provisions of Section 20 of the Surrey County Council Act 1985 is hereby endorsed on this planning permission. Copies of the Section may be obtained from the Council Offices or County Hal. Section 20 of this Act requires that when a building is erected or extended, proper provision must be made for the Fire Brigade to have means of access to the building or to any neighbouring buildings.

There are also requirements relating to access and facilities for the fire service contained in Part B of the Building Regulations 2000 (as amended).
3. The applicant should be mindful not to create excessive dust emissions during demolition works, particularly where any asbestos containing materials may be present. A Refurbishment and Demolition asbestos survey is required to determine if asbestos containing materials are present. If removal of asbestos containing materials is required appropriate removal (without significant damage), handling and disposal by competent persons is required. The Health & Safety Executive (HSE) have produced a guide to safe removal of asbestos containing materials, which outlines good practice, how to prepare and what equipment is needed, how to remove it and how to deal with the waste once removed. There is also information on the HSE website about how to comply with the regulations, including a more generic guide to working safely with asbestos - <http://www.hse.gov.uk/asbestos>
4. The applicant's attention is drawn to the requirements of the Party Wall Etc. Act 1996 in relation to work close to a neighbour's building/boundary.