

-PLANNING APPEALS

LIST OF APPEALS SUBMITTED BETWEEN 25 MARCH AND 20 APRIL 2017

<u>Planning Application Number</u>	<u>Inspectorate Ref.</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Appeal Start Date</u>
16/01357/FUL	APP/Z3635/W/17/3175192	London Irish Rugby Football Club The Avenue Sunbury On Thames TW16 5EQ	(Replacement of 4 no. detached 5 bedroom dwellings and) construction of 24 no. flatted residential units, parking, landscaping and associated works.	14.07.2017
16/01641/LBC	APP/Z3635/Y/17/3173999	Fresh Image Training 13 - 15 High Street Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4QY	Display of advertisement for gym (retrospective) on side wall	24.07.2017
17/00412/HOU	APP/Z3635/D/17/3176995	Willowmead Dunally Park Shepperton TW17 8LJ	Erection of a part two storey part single storey front extension.	21.07.2017
16/00370/FUL	APP/Z3635/W/17/3177681	Lookrite 13 Broadway Kingston Road Staines-upon-Thames	Change of use from hairdresser (class A1) and part of first floor flat (class C3) to a hot food takeaway (class A5) and external alterations including installation of extraction and ventilation equipment. (Appeal against condition restricting hours of opening).	25.07.2017

APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 13 JULY AND 10 AUGUST 2017

Site	11 Springfield Grove, Sunbury on Thames.
Planning Application No.:	17/00288/HOU
Proposed Development:	Erection of first floor front extension.
Appeal Reference:	APP/Z3635/D/17/3177081
Appeal Decision Date:	20/07/2017
Inspector's Decision	The appeal is allowed
Reason for Refusal	The proposed first floor front extension, by virtue of its location and design with a gable feature is considered to result in a development which would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area and will be visually obtrusive in the street scene. This is contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy & Policies DPD (2009) and guidance contained in the Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development (2011).
Inspector's Comments:	The Inspector commented that the main issue was the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that no other properties had a first floor front extension but highlighted that due to various alterations to other properties, there was a variation in the design and style in the street scene. The Inspector concluded that the proposed extension would not project further forward than the existing front element and its design would provide a sub-servient element. The variation in design would maintain the existing variety shown within the houses on the south side of Springfield Grove. It was concluded that the proposed extension would make a positive contribution and subject to matching materials would pay due regard to the scale, height, materials and other characteristics of the area. It would therefore comply with Policy EN1 of the CS&P DPD (2009).

Site	Communication Station adjacent to 2 Worple Avenue, Staines-Upon-Thames
Planning Application No.:	16/01953/T56

Proposed Development:	Replacement of existing 8m monopole and the installation of a 10m Alpha 26 monopole and installation of pogona cabinet and associated development.
Appeal Reference:	APP/Z3635/W/17/3171906
Appeal Decision Date:	14/07/2017
Inspector's Decision	The appeal is allowed
Reason for Refusal	The proposed telecommunications mast, in view of its siting, increased height and design and bulk would appear visually intrusive in the street scene and would therefore have an adverse impact upon visual amenity of the area when viewed from the public highway and adjoining residential properties alike. The proposal therefore does not comply with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009).
Inspector's Comments:	The Inspector commented that the main issue was the effect of the siting and appearance of the development upon the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that the proposal would improve mobile phone coverage and capacity in the area. While acknowledging that the proposed monopole would be higher and slightly wider than the existing, because of its slim appearance and separation distances to nearby properties, it was not considered that it would have a materially greater impact upon the character and appearance of the area than the existing mast. The Inspector also considered that the mast would not result in any significant loss of outlook for the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties nor would the additional equipment cabin have a materially greater adverse effect upon the street scene. The Inspector concluded that the proposal would be acceptable in terms of its siting and design and would not have a significantly detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area and would accord with the design and amenity aims of Policy EN1 of the CS&P DPD (2009).

Site	31 Glebeland Gardens, Shepperton.
Planning Application no.:	16/01803/FUL
Proposed Development:	Erection of new 1 bed maisonette on land adjoining existing house.
Appeal Reference:	APP/Z3635/W/17/3167116

Appeal Decision Date:	20/07/2017
Inspector's Decision	The appeal is dismissed
Reason for Refusal	The proposed development, by virtue of its design, size, bulk and mass including an undercroft parking area which provides a parking space below parking size standards and the inclusion of a supported part of the building to allow for access to the Right of Way represents an incongruous form of development and the overdevelopment of the site that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and contrary to Policy EN1 and CC3 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009).
Inspector's Comments:	The Inspector commented that the main issues are 1) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and 2) the adequacy of the proposed parking arrangements. The Inspector noted that there was a unified appearance to the appearance of the properties in the terrace. However, he commented that for the proposed development there would be a different design approach at ground floor level to allow for a right of way that crosses the site. The Inspector considered that the character and appearance of the maisonette would contrast sharply with that of other dwellings in the terrace, particularly due to its conspicuous location, being the first property within the terrace and would not comply with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD. In terms of parking, the undercroft space at a depth of 4m is below the standard size for a parking space and would result in visibility and pedestrian safety issues, conflicting with Policy CC3 of the CS&P DPD (2009). The Inspector concluded that the development would have a significantly adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, and that the proposed parking area would be unsatisfactory and would be in conflict with the development plan and the NPPF.

FUTURE HEARING / INQUIRY DATES

Council Ref.	Type of Appeal	Site	Proposal	Case Officer	Date
16/00135/ FUL	Hearing	The Paddocks rear of 237 - 245 Hithermoor Road, Stanwell Moor	Siting of static mobile home for one family.	KW/LT	TBA