

Planning Committee

11 December 2019



Planning Appeals

List of Appeals Submitted between 4 October and 27 November 2019

Planning Application / Enforcement Number	Inspectorate Ref.	Address	Description	Appeal Start Date
18/01627/FUL	APP/Z3635/W/19/3236959	Plot 5 Las Palmas Estate Sandhills Meadow Shepperton	Change of use of land to the keeping of horses, installation of post and rail boundary fencing and access gate.	07/10/19
19/00129/ENF	APP/Z3635/C/19/3236361 and PP/Z3635/W/19/3235760	32-34 Feltham Road, Ashford	The unlawful operational development of the land, by the erection of a large canopy and carwash structure.	23/10/19
19/00364/HOU	APP/Z3635/D/19/3233744	The Outlook Towpath Shepperton	Erection of an open single garage for domestic use.	04/11/19
19/00379/OUT	APP/Z3635/W/19/3237930	Land On South Side Of Shaftesbury Crescent Ashford Road Laleham	Outline Planning Permission with appearance reserved for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling house with associated parking and amenity space.	08/11/19
19/00696/FUL	APP/Z3635/W/19/3237477	Brecknock Stanwell New Road Staines-upon-Thames	The erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension including a roof extension incorporating side and rear dormers, and conversion into flats, comprising 3 no.2 bedroom flats, and 1 no. studio flat with	12/11/19

			associated parking and amenity space.	
19/00716/FUL	APP/Z3635/W /19/3237690	Clock Bungalow 191 Ashford Road Laleham	Change of use of land to extended residential curtilage for Clock Bungalow, 191 Ashford Road	13/11/19

Appeal Decisions Received 4 October and 27 November 2019

Site	Charlton Lane Ecopark Charlton Lane Shepperton
Planning Application No.:	19/00444/ADV
Proposed Development:	Retention of freestanding 6.52m tall non-illuminated sign at entrance
Reason for Refusal	The advertisement, by reason of its size, materials and prominent location, would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the locality, contrary to paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework, February 2019.
Appeal Reference:	APP/Z3635/Z/19/3233786
Appeal Decision Date:	15/11/19
Inspector's Decision	The appeal is allowed
Inspector's Comments:	The Inspector considered that the main issue was the effect of the proposal on the amenity of the locality. The Inspector noted that the sign was large and brightly coloured, and was prominently located at the entrance. However he also noted that due to the size of the junction in which the sign is located, the sign ' <i>...sits in space and is removed from any other comparable structures. The sign therefore appears as a standalone structure of a scale that is appropriate to the space in which it is located.</i> '

	<p>He commented that the colour of the sign takes its reference from the design of the waste management facility and the cut-away lettering is a distinct design choice which in the Inspectors view, '<i>...complements the vibrant and modern colour choice</i>' and the size, colour, and design of the sign was complementary to the surrounding context.</p> <p>The Inspector commented that, '<i>...I am satisfied that the sign does not appear as an intrusive or overly large addition to the road. Instead, it is of a suitable size for the context in which it is located. Consequently, I conclude that the sign has an acceptable effect on the amenity of the area.</i>' Therefore the sign accorded with the requirements of Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to protect the quality and character of places from poorly sited and designed advertisements.</p> <p>He also stated that the sign was acceptable on highway safety grounds.</p>
--	--

Site	41 Birch Grove Shepperton
Planning Application No.:	19/00558/HOU
Proposed Development:	Erection of side facing dormer
Reasons for Refusal	The proposed development would by reason of its scale and design, appear as an unacceptable dominant feature of the roof and will be visually obtrusive and out of character with the area contrary to policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 and the Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development 2011.
Appeal Reference:	APP/Z3635/D/19/3235109
Appeal Decision Date:	15/11/19
Inspector's Decision	The appeal is dismissed
Inspector's Comments:	The appeal site is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof, located in a short cul-de-sac where a number of similar properties are located. The Inspector noted that the property had previously been extended at roof level in the form of a side facing dormer window with flat roof, comparable in height with the ridge of the original roof. He commented

	<p>that this structure has the effect of increasing the scale and bulk of the original building, but that due its location on one side of the building the original form of the building can still be appreciated.</p> <p>However, noting that the proposal would replicate the appearance of the existing dormer window, he stated that the flat roof of both dormer windows would span the full width of the building (apart from a small step in the eaves line) and consequently the mass and bulk of the roof would be substantially increase. He considered this would significantly alter the form of the building in effect, turning it into a two storey building with a flat roof, dominating the form and appearance of the original building. Overall, the Inspector agreed that the roof alteration would have a visually obtrusive appearance that would be at odds with the smaller scale of the neighbouring buildings, consequently harming the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and failing to accord with EN1.</p>
--	--

Site	27 Leacroft Staines-upon-Thames
Planning Application No.:	
Proposed Development:	Erection of front and rear dormers and rooflights to create accommodation within the roofspace.
Reason for Refusal	The proposed development in terms of its design, scale and location is considered not to respect the proportions of the host building and would have an unacceptable visual impact upon the prevailing street scene and character of the area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 and the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development Supplementary Planning Document 2011.
Appeal Reference:	APP/Z3635/D/19/3234016
Appeal Decision Date:	15/11/19
Inspector's Decision	The appeal is dismissed

Inspector's Comments:	<p>The Inspector considered that the main issue was whether the proposed dormers were in character with the area. He noted that the property forms one half of a two storey building which contains two pairs of maisonettes which were originally symmetrical. He stated that the neighbouring property has a dormer window located towards the side facing gable end. Therefore he felt that the proposed front dormer would harm the symmetry and fail to complement the existing roof slope.</p> <p>Furthermore he also commented that the proposed rear dormer would occupy much of the existing roof slope and would therefore have the appearance of a three-storey structure with a flat roof. Therefore he considered it would dominate and overwhelm the existing building due to its size and overall appearance.</p> <p>He concluded that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p>
------------------------------	--