



Planning Committee

11 January 2023

Planning Appeals Report – V2.0 DRAFT

Appeals Started between 08 September 2022 – 16 December 2022

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
22/00467/HOU 54 Thames Meadow Shepperton TW17 8LT	18.10.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3303222 New roof to create accommodation in the roof space, incorporating balconies to front and rear and alterations to external appearance of building.
22/00451/FUL 82 Village Way Ashford TW15 2JU	11.10.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/22/3303412 Erection of a detached bungalow to rear of the site with associated amenity space and parking.

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
22/00540/FUL Reedsfield Court Reedsfield Road Ashford	12.10.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/22/3303976 Formation of new roof to create 2 no. flats, new external staircase, associated parking, amenity and cycle/ waste storage.
22/00285/FUL 45 Metcalf Road Ashford TW15 1HB	25.11.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/22/3304397 Erection of an attached two storey dwelling house (following demolition of existing detached garage) together with associated parking and amenity space. The creation of a new vehicular access onto Metcalf Road.
22/00796/HOU 22 Windmill Terrace Walton Bridge Road Shepperton	14.09.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3304576 Erection of a two storey front and side extension and a part single part two storey rear extension
22/00369/HOU 16 Sandhills Meadow Shepperton TW17 9HY	19.10.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3304749 Loft conversion including raising of the ridge height and a balcony. Side porch extension
22/01010/HOU 2 Ripston Road Ashford TW15 1PQ	25.11.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3309327 Erection of part two storey part single storey rear extension

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
22/00905/HOU 80 Thames Side Staines-upon-Thames TW18 2HF	25.11.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3308024 New roof extension over existing single storey side extension and extension to an existing rear facing dormer to create further accommodation in roof space.

Appeal Decisions Made between 08 September 2022 – 16 December 2022

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
18/00116/ENF Plot 10 Las Palmas Estate Las Palmas Estate Road	10.05.2021	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/C/21/3270987 Appeal against serving of an enforcement notice for the unauthorised operational development of gates, fencing and posts.	Appeal Dismissed	08.11.2022	<p>The Planning Inspector agreed that the gates, fencing and posts represent inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that they met the definition of building work rather than an engineering operation which the appellant argued it was and therefore appropriate in the Green Belt provided it preserved the openness of it as per para 150 of the NPPF regarding engineering operations in the Green Belt. The Inspector stated that very special circumstances do not exist to justify the development.</p> <p>The Inspector also considered the 'Openness' of the Green Belt and the impact the gates, fencing and posts had on the openness. The Inspector concluded that by reason of their height, solid and urbanising appearance, these items together have a significant enclosing effect. In this way, they reduce the openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>The appellant sought a temporary planning permission for 3-5 years to allow saplings to grow and to prevent fly tipping. The Inspector stated that granting of only a</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						temporary permission would not remedy the breach and would not be acceptable in planning terms. Measures taken by the appellant to reduce the visual impact of the development by means of green painting and planting of saplings also do not remedy the breach and fail to overcome the harm resulting from the breach. In conclusion the appeal was dismissed for ground (a) and (f) and the Enforcement Notice upheld requiring the removal of the gates, fencing and posts and all resultant materials.
21/00223/CPD 28 Ash Road Shepperton TW17 0DN	28.06.2021	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/X/21/3275492 Certificate of Lawfulness development for proposed erection of a single storey detached outbuilding at the rear.	Appeal Dismissed	07.11.2022	The Planning Inspector acknowledged that the proposed outbuilding complied with the dimensional constraints in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class E of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (GPDO). However, he was not convinced that the excessive space proposed led that the outbuilding is reasonably required to accommodate the proposed use. It has not been demonstrated that the outbuilding was required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. Consequently, the Planning Inspector found the Council's refusal to grant a certificate of lawful use or development in respect of the erection of a single storey detached

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						outbuilding were well-founded and as such the appeal was dismissed.
20/01438/OUT 5 Marlborough Road Ashford TW15 3PZ	21.01.2022	Written 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.	Appeal Dismissed	09.11.2022	<p>A joint decision was issued by the Inspectorate for both appeals.</p> <p>The Inspector noted Appeal A was an outline application and that the elevation plans were only indicative. They also noted that the site has planning permission for the demolition of the previous dwelling and the construction of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, and works had started on site.</p> <p>The Inspector identified that the main issues were the impact upon the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of the occupiers of a neighbouring property, and highway safety and parking. With Appeal B, there was a further issue relating to internal floor space.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that the site is located in a residential area comprising two storey properties and bungalows on largely consistent building lines. The Inspector also noted a variation in roof forms, adding visual</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p>interest to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>In the case of appeal A the inspector considered that the second floor would be unduly prominent and would appear in stark contrast to its surroundings. As such, appeal A was considered to be contrary to policy EN1.</p> <p>In the case of appeal B, whilst the scheme proposed an area of flat roof, as this would be set back from the street behind a traditional roof, it would have limited visibility and would not appear unduly prominent or incongruous. It was also noted that parking exceeded 50% of the frontage contrary to the SPD, but given the variation in parking across the street, this was not considered to cause visual harm. Appeal B was therefore considered to comply with policy EN1 in design terms.</p> <p>In terms of living conditions, it was noted that a neighboring property contained a ground floor window in the rear elevation. The Inspector considered Appeal A would likely breach the Council's 45° vertical and horizontal guides, when</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p>measured from this window and would result in that room being darker and more gloomy. The Inspector was also not satisfied that Appeal B would have an acceptable impact upon this window. Both appeals were found to be contrary to policy EN1 on amenity terms. However, in regards to balconies, as the elevation plans in appeal A were indicative, the Inspector did not raise concerns over this aspect.</p> <p>The Inspector found the highway impacts of both appeals to be acceptable in accordance with the objectives of policy CC3.</p> <p>The Inspector also considered that Appeal B would provide an unacceptable level of internal floor space for its future occupiers.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that both appeals would make a net contribution of 3 additional units when the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing supply. However, the overall harm of the scheme was not considered to be outweighed by this benefit and both appeals were dismissed.</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
20/01579/FUL 5 Marlborough Road Ashford TW15 3PZ	21.01.2022	Written 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.	Appeal Dismissed	09.11.2022	See comments above in 20/01438/OUT.
20/01506/FUL Sunbury Cross Ex Services Association Club Crossways Sunbury On Thames	08.02.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/21/3285212 The demolition of existing Sunbury Ex-Servicemen's Association Club and re-development of the site including the erection of three residential buildings of 4-storey, 6-storey and 9-storey comprising 69 flats with associated car-parking, cycle storage, landscaping and other associated works. As shown on drawing nos.!: S19/7407/01 and S19/7407/2 received 10/12/2020;	Appeal Dismissed	18.11.2022	The Planning Inspector raised concerns on the proposed layout for being over-dominant by car-parking and hard surfaces with very limited space for soft landscaping and tree planting. Given the level of built-up areas and limited space between the three buildings, the Planning Inspector felt that is constrained by the size of the site. These areas could easily become overshadowed and felt hemmed in, creating unattractive areas to spend time. As a result, the proposal was considered to create a sterile environment that would harm the character and appearance of the area. The Planning Inspector also found unsatisfactory the living conditions of the future occupiers in terms of enclosed area with poor outlook to some of the flats (being immediately adjacent to the boundary).

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
			<p>CROS-LON-0; /1; /2; /3; /4; /5; /6; /7; /8; 9 received 04/01/2021;</p> <p>20-0901 Rev. A and 20-0906 received 04/01/2021;</p> <p>CRO-PRa-1C; /2C; /3C; /4C; /5C; /6C; /7C; /8C; /9C; /10C; /11C; /12C; /13C; /14C; /15C received 19/03/2021;</p> <p>CRO-PRb-1C; /2C; /3C; /4C; /5C; /6C; /7C; /8C; /9C; /10C; /11C received 19/03/2021;</p> <p>CRO-PRc-1C; /2C; /3C; /4C; /5C received 19/03/2021</p>			Furthermore, the Planning Inspector are also unsatisfied that the proposed level of parking spaces together with the proposed mechanisms to counter demand would be adequate in this instance.
<p>20/00237/FUL</p> <p>Osmanstead Condor Road Laleham</p>	03.03.2022		<p>APP/Z3635/W/21/3285042</p> <p>Erection of six detached dwellings, 2 fronting Thames Side and 4 fronting Condor Road, with associated access, parking areas and amenity following demolition of existing house and outbuildings.</p>	Appeal Dismissed	03.11.2022	TBC

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
21/01785/HOU 10 Rosewood Drive Shepperton TW17 0HT	21.03.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3294416 Erection of a part single part two storey front extension, a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and changes to materials on front elevation	Appeal Dismissed	07.10.2022	<p>The inspector considered that the two-storey flank wall of the appeal site would be in much closer proximity to the shallow rear garden of no. 8 Rosewood Drive, closing a gap and thereby reducing the outlook and greatly increasing the enclosure of both no.8 Rosewood Drive and no9. Fairview Drive. As the appeal site is situated to the south of both no.8 Rosewood Drive and no. 9 Fairview Drive, the inspector considered that the proposed extensions would have a greater potential for overshadowing and an unacceptable overbearing effect on those neighbouring properties.</p> <p>The inspector concluded that whilst the existing arrangement intervenes in the 45-degree line, the appeal scheme would bring two-storey built form closer to those dwellings and it would therefore exacerbate the existing situation which would conflict with the development plan and the SPD.</p>
21/01392/RVC 5 Marlborough Road Ashford TW15 3PZ	24.03.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/21/3287804 Variation of Condition 2 (Approved Plans) imposed upon planning permission 21/00804/FUL to allow for changes to the elevations,	Appeal Allowed	25.11.2022	<p>*There was a joined dismissed decision issued by the Planning Inspector for the other two appeals within the site.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector acknowledged that the site benefit from recently approved S73 scheme. He also noted that this appeal scheme would amend the roof form to</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
			including the proposed roof, and floor layout.			<p>provide an enlarged front gable encompassing two additional windows at the roof level, and full gable ends to the main roof. The Planning Inspector noted that the increase bulk of the roof would add some prominence, but he considered the scale of the roof level openings would be modest and would appear subordinate within the roof slopes. Front gable features were evident within the street scene and as such disagreed with the proposal being incongruous and out of character within this setting.</p> <p>Whilst the Planning Inspector agreed that the appeal scheme would breach the 45 horizontal guide from nearest the boundary window, he noted that the breach would not be significant. Taken together the approved scheme and level of breach, the Planning Inspector was in an opinion that the overall living conditions of the nearby occupants would not be materially different to the original approved scheme. Consequently, the appeal was allowed.</p>
21/00614/OUT 36 - 38 Minsterley Avenue	07.04.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/21/3288513 Outline planning permission with appearance and landscaping reserved for the erection of 5 detached dwellings, comprising 4 x 4	Appeal Dismissed	25.10.2022	The Inspector identified that the main issue was the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
<p>Shepperton TW17 8QT</p>			<p>bedroom dwellings and 1 x 5 bedroom dwelling, with associated parking and amenity space following the demolition of 36 Minsterley Avenue.</p>			<p>The Inspector noted that the site is located in a low-density residential area, typically comprising two-storey detached dwellings, with the occasional semi-detached pairs. The Inspector further commented that plots were generally spacious with varying set-backs to from the roadway contributing to the surrounding openness.</p> <p>The Inspector commented that despite achieving minimum garden sizes, the proposed dwellings would be characterised by narrow plot and dwelling widths and would not reflect plot and dwelling widths in the locality. They further considered that the dwellings would appear cramped and that the development would fail to reflect the broadly consistent dwelling frontage lines immediately adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The Inspector further commented that the development read as being discordant and unsympathetic with the surrounding Avenue and would cause significant and unacceptable harm to the character of the area, contrary to the objectives of policy EN1 and the Council's SPD on design.</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						It was acknowledged that the contribution of 4 additional dwellings to the Councils 5 year housing supply would create some benefits, as the Council cannot demonstrate a 5-year housing supply. However, the benefits of this were not considered to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the harm As such the appeal was dismissed.
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 that 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.

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p>The Inspector noted that most dwellings in the vicinity of the site were modest two storey dwellings or bungalows.</p> <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</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						with policy EN1 on amenity grounds and the appeal was dismissed.
21/01117/FUL 74 Stanley Road Ashford TW15 2LQ	06.07.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/22/3297303 Creation of new attached dwelling with associated parking and amenity space.	Appeal Dismissed	07.10.2022	The Inspector considered the proposed dwelling would be noticeably narrower and shorter than the other two in the terrace and the somewhat cramped nature of the scheme would be exemplified by the front garden of the new dwelling being largely taken up by parking; and having the parking space serving No. 74 located on the far side of the site, away from the house. He therefore concluded that the overall effect would be a somewhat contrived development that would be at odds with the establish street scene and pattern of development and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
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	Appeal Dismissed	04.10.2022	TBC

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
			on 22 July 2021 and amended plan number 1220B received on 7 September 2021.			
21/00610/FUL Land At Vineries Nurseries Site Spout Lane Stanwell Moor	25.04.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/21/3287743 Retention of existing hardstanding (retrospective)	Appeal Dismissed	18.11.2022	The Inspector considered that the laying of the existing hardstanding on the site would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt and would therefore constitute 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt. He noted the existing planning situation (lawful Class B8 storage use) on the site and gave significant weight to this. He also noted that the hardstanding would bring operational benefits to the site such as the reduction of mud being tracked on the highway, items stored on site being cleaner and a tidier appearance. However, he did not regard the considerations in favour of the development did not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Consequently, 'very special circumstances' to justify the development in the Green Belt did not exist
21/01487/FUL 19 Sidney Road Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4LP	26.04.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/22/3290169 Erection of a new 2 bedroom-3 persons single dwelling house at the rear of 19 Sidney Road (Proposed No.21 New Street) with associated	Appeal Dismissed	10.11.2022	The inspector considered that the proximity of the proposed dwelling to No. 19 New Street and its position in relation to the carriageway would be at odds with the existing pattern of development, result in an uncharacteristic and cramped form of development. The proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupants of No.19

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
			parking, cycle store, waste storage and amenity space.			New Street and fail to provide satisfactory living conditions to future occupants with regards to privacy. It would also harm the living conditions of the occupants of the appeal property and Nos 17 and 21 Sidney Road with regards to outlook. The proposal would conflict with highway/public safety. Overall, the inspector considered that the harm caused to character and living conditions of existing and proposed occupants would outweigh the modest contribution of one dwelling.
21/01828/HOU 96B Windmill Road Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 7HB	26.04.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3297258 Creation of hip to gable roof extension, conversion of loft to habitable room and erection of rear facing dormer window	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.
21/01962/HOU 20 Florence Gardens Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1HG	23.05.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3297987 Construction of a double storey side extension, single storey side and rear extension and loft conversion comprising of side dormer and Velux skylights.	Appeal Dismissed	30.09.2022	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. The Inspector acknowledged that there was an extant planning permission at the stie. They also noted that guidance in the Council's SPD on the Design of Residential

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p>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>
<p>21/01290/FUL</p> <p>97 Feltham Road Ashford TW15 1BS</p>	11.05.2022	Written Representation	<p>APP/Z3635/W/22/3291285</p> <p>Roof alterations to create a new one bedroom flat including two side dormer windows, a rear rooflight and a front gable extension.</p>	Appeal Dismissed	07.10.2022	<p>In combination, the front gable extension and side dormers would substantially alter the roof profile and design which in the Inspectors view would harm the building's character and appearance. Furthermore, the front gable extension would be out of character with the subservient dormers and</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						bay roofs elsewhere along the street and, along with the side dormers, conflict with the aims and guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on the Design of Residential Extensions and New Residential Development (2011) (SPD) and Policy EN1 of the CS&P DPD.
21/01933/HOU 28 Ensign Way Stanwell Staines-upon- Thames	18.07.2022	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	The Planning Inspector noted that a square piece of land on the corner at the junction provides side gardens for the appeal side and neighbouring property and the same for opposite of the road. Immediately adjacent to the high fences is landscaped buffers which assist in maintaining open frontages to add for the character. The buffer strip also extends behind the pavement in front of the neighbour's garden on Viscount Road but ends at the appeal site where the fence subject of this appeal runs up to the pavement edge. The planning inspector considered this to create a hard boundary at odds with, and harmful to, the open character. Consequently, the development therefore conflicts with Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document 2009 and the NPPF.
22/00069/HOU	03.08.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/22/3298205 Erection of an extension to rear along with the creation	Appeal Dismissed	25.11.2022	TBC

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
72 Thames Street Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 6AF			of a new floor and rooms within the roof.			
21/01706/FUL Glenmore Green Street Sunbury-on-Thames	06.06.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/22/3291625 Conversion of House of multiple occupation (HMO) to 9 residential flats involving extension and alteration to front and rear with associated parking, refuse storage and amenity space as shown on drawings numbered 19_1183/002 C, 008 A, and 015 C received on 24 Nov 2021 and 009 C, 010 B, 014 D, 105 B, 110 B and Proposed Site Plan and Proposed First Floor Plan received on 01 Nov 2021.	Appeal Dismissed	29.11.2022	TBC
22/00492/RVC Glenmore Green Street Sunbury-on-Thames	15.08.2022	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/22/3301717 Variation of plan number condition of PA ref 20/00052/FUL for the extension and alterations of the building to form 8 flats, to allow for the floorspace at second floor level to be	Appeal Dismissed	29.11.2022	TBC

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
			used as extra bedrooms and bathrooms for the approved first floor flats, thereby creating 3 duplex flats. As shown on drawings numbered 19.1183/009 proposed site plan, 009A proposed GF plan, 111 A proposed FF plan and 112A proposed 2nd F plan received on 04/04/2022			
22/00310/HOU 3 Reedsfield Road Ashford TW15 2HE	19.07.2022	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	<p>The Inspector identified that the main issue was the effect upon the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>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 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</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
						<p>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 subordinate to the main house. They therefore considered the proposal to accord with policy EN1 and the appeal was allowed subject to conditions.</p>
<p>22/00436/HOU</p> <p>74 Park Road Ashford TW15 1EU</p>	04.07.2022	Fast Track Appeal	<p>APP/Z3635/D/22/3301762</p> <p>Proposed two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, loft conversion and rear dormer.</p>	Appeal Allowed	07.11.2022	TBC

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspector's Comments
22/00369/HOU 16 Sandhills Meadow Shepperton TW17 9HY	19.10.2022	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/22/3304749 Loft conversion including raising of the ridge height and a balcony. Side porch extension	Appeal Withdrawn	29.11.2022	This appeal was withdrawn on the applicant's request.
21/01848/HOU 163 Staines Road Laleham Staines-upon-Thames	23.09.2022	N/A	N/A Construction of a vehicle access with a crossover	Appeal Lapsed	29.11.2022	This appeal was lapsed as the required supporting documentation from the applicant was received after the deadline