

-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>
16/01818/RVC	APP/Z3635/W/ 17/3169239	72 Charles Road Laleham	Variation of Condition 3 of PA ref 14/01091/HOU to reword the condition regarding the use of the existing outbuilding, to allow it to be used ancillary,(including a bedroom) to the domestic enjoyment of the main house by a family member.	29/03/2017
16/01933/HOU	APP/Z3635/D/ 17/3170289	13 Hallows Grove Sunbury On Thames	Erection of 3 dormer windows in the side elevation in connection with the conversion of the roof space into habitable accommodation.	05/04/2017
16/00311/ENF	APP/Z3635/C/ 17/3167818	Land at Stanwell Farm, Bedfont Road, Stanwell	Without planning permission, the making of a material change of use of the land comprising (1) the use of the site for airport car parking (2) lawful garden land laid with hardstanding and incorporated into the existing yard and (3) a boundary fence erected along the western end of the yard.	13/04/2017

APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED BETWEEN 25 MARCH AND 20 APRIL 2017

Site	Grass Verge On Northern Side Of Staines Road East, Sunbury On Thames
Planning Application no.:	16/01333/T56
Proposed Development:	Installation of a 13.5m high T range column with 4 no. shrouded antennas along with associated ancillary works.
Appeal Reference:	APP/Z3635/W/16/3162686
Appeal Decision Date:	24/03/2017
Inspector's Decision	The appeal is allowed
Reason for Refusal	The proposed telecommunications mast would by reason of its siting on an open area of land and its height and bulk would appear visually intrusive and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the street scene. 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 proposed mast on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that the proposal differed from a similar scheme for a mast in 2015 in a number of respects; "firstly, it was sited further west, closer to the racecourse entrance; secondly, it was both taller and more bulky and thirdly, it also included a series of base cabinets that would have been sited alongside the mast and close to the back of the footway. With the current proposal the Inspector noted that there was a significant screen of vegetation that occupied the space to the back of the footway. The mast would be positioned between two lamp columns, where the grass verge is significantly less than at the racecourse entrance and would be seen against the trees and roadside vegetation for anyone travelling eastwards and would be sufficiently far from the racecourse entrance not to appear unduly prominent for those travelling west. The Inspector commented that the mast "would not appear excessively bulky or top heavy" and the proposal did not include a series of cabinets. Consequently the Inspector felt that the proposal would not be unacceptably visually intrusive and was materially different from the previous appeal decision. Based on search for sites information submitted by the appellant, the Inspector concluded that the "appeal

	<p>proposal provides a reasonable balance between the requirements of the operators and the environmental impact of the mast.” Consequently, the proposal complied with policy EN1. Finally, the Inspector acknowledged local concerns over health implications but noted that paragraph 46 of the National Planning Policy Framework stated that “local planning authorities should not determine health safeguards if the proposal meets International Commission guidelines for public exposure to non-ionising radiation. Confirmation that the proposal would meet these guidelines was provided in this case and there are therefore no health reasons for rejecting the scheme.”</p>
--	---

Site:	Land Rear Of 59 Vicarage Road, Sunbury On Thames
Planning Application no.:	16/00783/FUL
Proposed Development:	Erection of a two storey, one bedroom dwellinghouse following demolition of the existing garages.
Appeal Reference:	APP/Z3635/W/16/3164453
Appeal Decision Date:	11/04/2017
Inspector’s Decision	The appeal is dismissed
Reasons for refusal:	<p>The proposed development, in terms of its design, scale and location, fails to respect the design and proportions of the adjoining terrace of 1-5 Copperfields and is considered to be visually obtrusive and out of character with the surrounding area and will not make a positive contribution to the street scene, contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 and Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011.</p> <p>The proposed development is considered to represent a cramped and contrived form of development which would result in an overdevelopment of the site, would provide a poor standard of amenity for future occupiers with no amenity space and poor outlook and daylight and sunlight to the dwelling, contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 and Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011.</p>

Inspector's Comments:	<p>The Inspector considered that there were two main issues; the impact on the character and appearance of the area and whether the proposed occupiers would have satisfactory living conditions with regard to amenity space, outlook and light.</p> <p>On the first issue, the Inspector commented that the “proposed design of the dwelling would involve a part mansard roof at first floor level but with a side element with a ‘cat-slide’ roof sloping up to a ridge” and his would contrast with the adjoin dwelling, no. 1 rather than improving the context of that building. The Inspector felt that the “proposal would appear to extend the terrace due to the lack of a gap between this and No 1. It would look at odds with the traditional appearance of the 2 storey hipped roof of the existing terrace. The proposed under-croft parking space would appear as a dark void below the first floor of the dwelling which would be unusual along the road”. He also considered that the loss of space and landscaping with no scope for replacement parking would have a harmful impact on the character of the area, contrary to policy EN1, the SPD and also the NPPF.</p> <p>On the second issue, living conditions, the Inspector noted that no external amenity space would be provided and recreation space nearby would not completely compensate for this.</p> <p>The Inspector also felt that the ground floor windows would have natural limited daylight and the computer room on the ground floor would “feel dark and oppressive”. In addition, the bedroom on the first floor “would have no outlook which would give that room a claustrophobic feel”, contrary to policy EN1 and the NPPF.</p>
------------------------------	---

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
16/00095/ ENF	Hearing	124 Hawthorn Way Shepperton	Enforcement notice concerning the unauthorised erection of a rear extension including balcony.	MCh/LT	06/06/2017