



Planning Committee

3 February 2021

Planning Appeals Report – V2.0 ISSUED

List of Appeals Started between 10 December 2020 – 21 January 2021

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
20/00218/FUL The Mill Heathrow Horton Road Stanwell Moor	13.01.2021	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/W/20/3261719 Retention of Car Park
20/00753/FUL 97 Village Way Ashford	14.01.2021	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/20/3263055 Erection of part two storey part single storey side and rear extensions and roof extension including increase in ridge height and installation of rear and side facing dormers. Land lowering to allow recessed single storey extension.

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
TW15 2JY			New boundary fence along northern boundary and cycle store. Conversion of property into 4 no flats.
19/01651/FUL Land To Rear Of 39-51 High Street Stanwell	14.01.2021	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/20/3263544 Erection of a pair of two no. semi-detached dwellings with associated amenity space and parking.

Appeal Decisions Received 03 December 2020 – 21 January 2021

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
20/00588/HOU 7 Vereker Drive Sunbury On Thames TW16 6HQ	08.12.2020	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/20/3257786 Erection of part two storey part single storey rear extension, partial conversion of garage to habitable space with new roof over and single storey side infill element.	Appeal Allowed	18.01.2021	The main issue was the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector agreed that there is a 'pleasing design consistency in respect of the roof shapes, use of materials and the scale of properties when viewed from Vereker Drive and that this adds positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the area'. However, he considered that there was not the same level of design consistency to the rear of the dwellings in this part of the street. He also noted what he considered to be a 'very similar rear extension at No 15 Vereker Drive'. He considered that the extension would not be noticeable from this street and the proposed alterations would not cause harm to the distinctiveness of the property when viewed from the front. He also considered that while the extension

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						would be noticeable from the rear of Nos 5 and 9 Vereker Drive, it would not look out of place in the context of the various extensions that have taken place to the rear of these properties. The Inspector was also satisfied that the development as a whole would be subordinate in scale to the house and that harm would not be caused to the character and appearance of the area.