

## Planning Appeals Report - V1.0 ISSUED

## Appeals Started between 20 January 2022 – 14 March 2022

| Case Ref &<br>Address                                 | Date<br>Started | Procedure                 | Appeal Ref & Nature  |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------|--|
| 21/00054/FUL  The Boatyard Clarks Wharf Thames Street | 21.01.2022      | Written<br>Representation | APP/Z3635/W/21/3283432 Retention of Part change of use of an existing building to provide a flood protected raised external work platform and secure internal workshop on the same level to include an office, store and washroom facilities for Wharf Craft an established boatyard operating on this site as shown on drawings numbered PWS 20/01-8 received on 07/01/2021 |
| 20/01438/OUT  | 21.01.2022      | Written<br>Representation | APP/Z3635/W/21/3282635  Outline Planning Permission with appearance and landscaping reserved for the erection of a 3 storey block comprising 4 flats with associated parking and amenity space, following demolition of the existing dwelling.   |

| Case Ref &<br>Address  | Date<br>Started | Procedure                 | Appeal Ref & Nature  |
|--|-----------------|---------------------------|--|
| 5 Marlborough<br>Road Ashford<br>TW15 3PZ  |                 |                           |  |
| 21/01065/FUL  12 Thames Meadow Shepperton TW17 8LT   | 21.01.2022      | Written<br>Representation | APP/Z3635/W/21/3284482 Replacement dwelling following demolition of the existing house and annex   |
| 20/01579/FUL  5 Marlborough Road Ashford TW15 3PZ  | 21.01.2022      | Written<br>Representation | APP/Z3635/W/21/3282639  The erection of a 3 storey building comprising 4 self-contained flats (comprising 2 x 1 bedroom _ 2 x 2 bedroom units with associated parking and amenity space, following the demolition of the existing dwelling.  |
| 21/01688/HOU  2 Lois Drive Shepperton TW17 8BQ   | 25.01.2022      | Fast Track<br>Appeal      | APP/Z3635/D/22/3290857  Erection of a rear extension, extension to the existing garage, loft conversion with balcony, roof alterations to include crown roof, roof lights and roof pitch increase to 45 degrees.   |
| 21/00134/FUL  115 Feltham Hill Road & Land At The Rear Of 113- 127 Feltham Hill Road Ashford | 02.02.2022      | Written<br>Representation | APP/Z3635/W/21/3284411 Proposed redevelopment of site for the erection of 5 no residential units, following demolition of existing buildings as shown on drawings numbered 2020/P0091 LP B, 105 A, 110 B and 111 B received on 26 January 2021 and amended plan numbered C100 B, 100 F and 112 C received on 16 March 2021 |

## Appeal Decisions Made between 20 January 2022 – 14 March 2022

| Case Ref &<br>Address  | Date<br>Received | Procedure            | Appeal Ref & Nature   | Decision            | Decision<br>Date | Inspector's Comments   |
|--|------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 21/00680/HOU  5 Guildford Street Staines-upon- Thames TW18 2EQ | 25.09.2021       | Fast Track<br>Appeal | APP/Z3635/D/21/3278987 Proposed roof alterations that would include raising the ridge height and the installation of an eastern flank facing dormer with additional rooflights on the western flank elevation to create additional habitable space. | Appeal<br>Dismissed | 23.02.2022       | The proposed dormer would appear large and unsympathetic to the design of the house's roof. It would appear dominant and out of proportion with the building. The raising of the eaves would make the house appear heavy and awkward.  As a result, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy EN1 of the CS and the SPD. |
| 21/00754/HOU  55 Chertsey Road Ashford TW15 1SR                | 05.11.2021       | Fast Track<br>Appeal | APP/Z3635/D/21/3281886 Erection of a part single storey, part two storey flank extension  | Appeal<br>Dismissed | 24.01.2022       | The proposed two storey side element would significantly close the gap with the neighbouring property, creating a terracing effect.  Due to its gable roof, the proposal would also significantly increase the bulk of the host building which would appear as a dominant feature and markedly at odds with the principally hipped roofs forms                               |

| Case Ref &<br>Address  | Date<br>Received | Procedure              | Appeal Ref & Nature  | Decision          | Decision<br>Date | Inspector's Comments   |
|--|------------------|------------------------|--|-------------------|------------------|--|
|  |                  |                        |  |                   |                  | of the host and the other dwellings in this group.  Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policy EN1 of the CS and the SPD.   |
| 20/01217/FUL  Land To Rear 54 Bruce Avenue Shepperton TW17 9DW | 05.11.2021       | Written Representation | APP/Z3635/W/21/3282159 Erection of 2 bungalows following demolition of garages as shown on drawings numbered SLP-01, BLP-01, 02, ELV-01, 02, FLP-01, 02 and SEC-01 received on 20/10/2020. | Appeal<br>Allowed | 26.01.2022       | The appeal site consists of a piece of land with 14 unused garages. The access is via a narrow track between two buildings.  The parties agree that the two dwellings proposed for the site would generate approx. 9 movements per day, with one movement during the morning. The CHA, notes that this level of traffic would give rise to unacceptable highway risk, particularly during the morning peak when there are a significant number of pedestrians in the area, including children using the facilities in the area.  Due to the height of the walls on either side of the access the required visibility splays do not exist and this could be made worse if vegetation were to grow up. |

| Case Ref &<br>Address | Date<br>Received | Procedure | Appeal Ref & Nature | Decision | Decision<br>Date | Inspector's Comments   |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|----------|------------------|--|
|                       |                  |           |                     |          |                  | The parties have set out differing positions as to what should be considered to the potential traffic generation from the site as at present. However the Inspector not4s that he considers that the site could be used and there could be some traffic generated to and from the site using the existing access with its lack of visibility splays.                               |
|                       |                  |           |                     |          |                  | However, the Inspector states, 'I am satisfied that while the visibility splays do not meet the relevant criteria, given the low speeds in the area, that there are movements associated with other accesses in the area with no accidents reported to me and the existing use of the site, the proposal would not increase the risk to highway safety to an unacceptable extent.' |
|                       |                  |           |                     |          |                  | Therefore, the proposal would comply with Policy CC2 and paragraph 111 of the NPPF which requires development to only be refused if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.   |

| Case Ref &<br>Address                       | Date<br>Received | Procedure            | Appeal Ref & Nature   | Decision            | Decision<br>Date | Inspector's Comments  |
|---|------------------|----------------------|---|---------------------|------------------|---|
| 21/00903/HOU  74 Park Road Ashford TW15 1EU | 05.11.2021       | Fast Track<br>Appeal | APP/Z3635/D/21/3284730  Erection of a part two storey part single storey side extension and single storey rear extension.  Proposed hip to gable roof extension with raised ridge height and the installation of a rear facing dormer with Juliet balconies and 3 no rooflights to the front. | Appeal<br>Dismissed | 24.01.2022       | The Inspector considered that the hip to gable extensions would significantly increase the scale and bulk of the host building resulting in the dwelling having a very dominant appearance in the streetscene, particularly due to its prominence on this corner plot. That impact would be exacerbated by the large, flat-roofed dormer which would give the host building a very top-heavy appearance. In addition, the full height glazing and Juliet-style balcony in the proposed rear dormer, would result in overlooking, along with a significant perception of being overlooked, that would have a harmful impact living conditions of neighbours. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document. |