

## **PLANNING APPEALS**

### **LIST OF APPEALS SUBMITTED BETWEEN 4 OCTOBER AND 1 NOVEMBER 2018**

<b>Planning Application Number</b>	<b>Inspectorate Ref.</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Appeal Start Date</b>
17/01791/HOU	APP/Z3635/W/18/3203670	15 Park Road Stanwell Staines-upon-Thames TW19 7PB	Erection of vehicle crossover.	08/10/18
17/01938/FUL	APP/Z3635/W/18/3209382	20 Bridge Street Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4TW	Erection of a five storey building of 9 self-contained flats comprising 3 no. 1 bed flats, 5 no. 2 bed flats and 1 no. 3 bed flats with associated cycle parking following demolition of existing two storey building.	12/10/18
18/00804/HOU	APP/Z3635/D/18/3210997	28 Hadrian Way Stanwell Staines-upon-Thames TW19 7HF	Erection of part two storey part single storey side and rear extension.	16/10/18
18/00961/HOU	APP/Z3635/D/18/3211066	Willow Hayne Pharaohs Island Shepperton TW17 9LN	Erection of a two storey side extension and associated veranda.	16/10/18
18/00788/HOU	APP/Z3635/D/18/3211326	7 Squires Road Shepperton TW17 0LQ	Erection of part single, part two storey side/rear extension.	16/10/18
18/00631/HOU	APP/Z3635/D/18/3206638	Cheyne Cottage 7 Oaks Road Stanwell Staines-upon-Thames	Erection of a detached double garage.	18/10/18

**APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 4 OCTOBER AND 1 NOVEMBER 2018**

<b>Site</b>	Sans Souci 35 Hamhaugh Island Shepperton TW17 9LP
<b>Planning Application No.:</b>	17/01322/FUL
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	Erection of replacement dwelling following demolition of existing.
<b>Reason for Refusal</b>	The proposed development represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt for which no very special circumstances have been demonstrated. It will result in the site having a more urban character, will diminish the openness of the Green Belt and conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The proposal is therefore contrary to Section 9 (Protecting Green Belt land) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Policy EN2 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 and Saved Local Plan Policy GB1
<b>Appeal Reference:</b>	APP/Z3635/W/18/3194902
<b>Appeal Decision Date:</b>	05/10/2018
<b>Inspector's Decision</b>	The appeal is dismissed.
<b>Inspector's Comments:</b>	<p>The Inspector considered that the main issues were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Whether the proposal would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, including the effect on the openness of the Green Belt.</li><li>• If the development is inappropriate, whether the harm, by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. If so would this amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal.</li></ul> <p>On the first point the Inspector felt that the overall increase in height and over such a depth and sited centrally in the plot was "compelling". It would be, he felt, "clearly conspicuous and perceived as more visually intrusive in its surroundings. It would therefore have a greater impact on openness than the existing development". The replacement building would, therefore, be materially larger than the buildings it would replace, would have a greater impact on openness and consequently the</p>

exception outlined in (d) of Paragraph 145 of the NPPF did not apply. He also considered that the site did not constitute previously developed land' because land in built up areas such as residential gardens is excluded from the definition in the NPPF. As a consequence, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is by definition, harmful. It would also have a greater and more harmful impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

In terms of other matters, the Inspector agreed that the scheme would provide betterment in terms of flood resistance and resilience but there was nothing to suggest that such improvements or betterment could not be achieved with an alternative and smaller scheme. Also, the proposal would provide a more attractive standard of living over the current arrangement, including in energy efficiency and layout terms. However, the Inspector commented that these were also plot land developments that were only ever intended for occasional use. He also acknowledged that an extension may, theoretically, be erected as a full back position although it would be of a much lower height and lesser scale and bulk than the appeal proposal.

The Inspector concluded that the development represented inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt. In addition, the dwelling by reason of its size, caused harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist. Consequently the appeal was dismissed.