



Planning Committee

19 October 2022

Planning Appeals Report – V1.0 ISSUED

Appeals Started between 08 September 2022 – 06 October 2022

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
21/00633/FUL 484 London Road Ashford TW15 3AD	15.09.2022	TBC	Replacement of the existing bungalow with an apartment building comprising 8 dwellings (3 x 2 bed; 4 x 1 bed; 1 x studio)
21/01848/HOU	23.09.2022	TBC	Construction of a vehicle access with a crossover

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
163 Staines Road Laleham Staines- upon-Thames			
22/00418/FUL Stanwell Farm Bedfont Road Stanwell	23.09.2022	TBC	Change of use to a builders merchants yard (Sui Generis) with associated ancillary office and sales area.

Appeal Decisions Made between 08 September 2022 – 06 October 2022

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
21/01959/HOU 51 Penton Avenue Staines-upon-Thames TW18 2NA	08.04.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3295296 Proposed loft conversion that would include hip to gable extensions, the installation of a rear facing dormer with Juliet Balcony and 3 no rooflights within the front roof slope.	Appeal Allowed	30.09.2022	The Planning Inspector noted that gabled roofs were a feature of the area, although most of the bungalows in the immediate vicinity have retained their modest hipped roof form. Hip to gable extensions at the appeal site were the subject of a previous Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Use or Development (CLOPUD) (Council ref. 13/00414/CPD) and as such, the Planning Inspector considered this forms a fallback position in respect of the appeal scheme.
21/01872/HOU 10 Avon Road Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 7TB	11.04.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3295167 Erection of a first floor side/rear extension and part single storey rear extension.	Appeal Dismissed	04.10.2022	The Inspector identified that the main issues were the impact upon the character of the area and the living conditions of the occupiers of no.8 Avon Road. The Inspector noted that most dwellings in the vicinity of the site were modest two storey dwellings or bungalows.

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p>The Inspector did not consider that there would be a terracing effect upon no.8 and raised no concerns over the asymmetrical roof.</p> <p>However, the Inspector further considered that the two storey depth would present a massive unarticulated flank, which would be prominent, out of scale and proportion with the host dwelling, also appearing incongruous and intrusive in the street scene. As such the proposal was considered to conflict with policy EN1.</p> <p>The Inspector also noted that a first floor window would abut the boundary with no.8 Avon Road, and would allow direct overlooking into the rear garden of this property. The window would also open over the boundary. A condition requiring obscure glazing would have resulted in a poor standard of outlook and would not appropriately address the issue. The proposal was therefore also found to conflict with policy EN1 on amenity</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						grounds and the appeal was dismissed.
21/01205/PCO Elizabeth House 56 - 60 London Road Staines-upon-Thames	25.04.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/21/3288533 Prior approval notification for 2 additional storeys above the existing office building, comprising 12 residential units as shown on drawings numbered 1100, 1200B, 1201B, 1202A 1203,1221A, 1222A, 1223A, 1224A, 1225, 1300A and 1320A received on 22 July 2021 and amended plan number 1220B received on 7 September 2021.	Appeal Dismissed	04.10.2022	<p>The Inspector considered the main issue to be whether the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and the wider area, with particular regard to London Road.</p> <p>He describes the appeal site as a three-storey red brick office building and the building is flanked on either side by office type buildings of broadly similar On the opposite side of the road buildings are generally two storeys in height. Brick is the predominant finished material on buildings along this part of London Road. He notes that the existing building, "...offers a coherent and generally uniform design and appearance, that sits well amongst the buildings either side and opposite.'</p> <p>He goes on to note that whilst the proposal will be set in from the sides and front, it would result in a</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p>building taller than those immediately around it, increasing the building's visibility and prominence. The proposed additional storeys would be finished in a metal grey cladding whose appearance and vertical seams would jar awkwardly with the red brick and horizontal emphasis of the existing fenestration pattern of the building.</p> <p>The Inspector notes that having set back storeys and a contrasting material, can be an acceptable method of achieving additional height to a building. However, describes the appearance of the proposal as 'top-heavy' and as if the '<i>... new storeys having been placed on top of the building's roof, with little reference or relationship to the floors below.</i>'</p> <p>In addition he goes on to note that it would appear '<i>... manifestly at odds with the form and appearance of the existing building. This creates an awkward juxtaposition which is accentuated</i></p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p><i>by the proposal being two storeys.'</i></p> <p>He concludes that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the external appearance of the building itself and when taken in combination with the building's additional height, would also harm the London Road Street scene and thus the appearance of the wider area.</p>
<p>21/01828/HOU</p> <p>96B Windmill Road Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 7HB</p>	26.04.2022	Fast Track Appeal	<p>APP/Z3635/D/22/3297258</p> <p>Creation of hip to gable roof extension, conversion of loft to habitable room and erection of rear facing dormer window</p>	Appeal Dismissed	04.10.2022	The Inspector considered that the appeal scheme would appear as a poorly designed piecemeal addition, which would be incongruous in the street scenes and out of character with the individualistic yet cohesive character of the area.
<p>21/01962/HOU</p> <p>20 Florence Gardens Staines-upon-</p>	03.05.2022	Fast Track Appeal	<p>APP/Z3635/D/22/3297987</p> <p>Construction of a double storey side extension, single storey side and rear extension and loft conversion comprising of</p>	Appeal Dismissed	30.09.2022	<p>The Inspector identified that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.</p> <p>The Inspector acknowledged that there was an extant planning</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
Thames TW18 1HG			side dormer and Velux skylights.			<p>permission at the stie. They also noted that guidance in the Council's SPD on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development on well-designed dormers.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that the dormer would not be set in 1 metre from the roof edge and would not be set down from the ridge as required by the SPD guidance. The Inspector also considered that the dormer would have a dominant effect and would be disproportionately large in scale. They also considered it to be unduly prominent and incongruous in the street scene.</p> <p>The Inspector acknowledged other dormers in the area, although they were not considered to be as prominent or dominant as the appeal scheme. The Inspector also gave weight to the dormer granted in the extant planning permission at the site. However, they considered that proposal would conflict with policy EN1 and the appeal was dismissed.</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
21/01933/HOU 28 Ensign Way Stanwell Staines-upon-Thames	24.05.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3299564 The erection of a single storey side extension and a detached outbuilding to the front (following demolition of existing detached garage with existing storage structure). Reposition and amended high boundary treatment fronting the highway on the northern side comprising 1.85 metres high timber fence with concrete posts (partially retrospective).	Appeal Dismissed	21.09.2022	TBC
22/00310/HOU 3 Reedsfield Road Ashford TW15 2HE	27.06.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3301977 Erection of a single storey rear extension, two storey side extension and conversion of existing garage into a habitable room (revised scheme to planning application: 21/01614/HOU)	Appeal Allowed	22.09.2022	The Inspector identified that the main issue was the effect upon the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector commented that there was a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses of different designs and sizes in the street. They also considered that side accesses provided gaps between houses which varied in width but were

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p>important to the character and appearance of the street scene.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that the scheme included converting the garage into a habitable room and adding a 2 storey side extension which would sit over the top of the garage and extend behind it. They noted it would be set in 0.5 metres from the neighbours extension.</p> <p>The Inspector acknowledged that the gap above the existing garage creates a visual break between the two houses. However, they were satisfied that the 0.5 metre gap between the extension and the neighbouring property, combined with the difference in height between the two houses, and in particular the lower side extension to the neighbouring property, would provide a visual gap sufficient to avoid the houses appearing to form part of a terrace or a continuous frontage.</p> <p>The Inspector further considered the two storey rear wing and second floor elements to be</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Received	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						subordinate to the main house. They therefore considered the proposal to accord with policy EN1 and the appeal was allowed subject to conditions.