



Planning Committee

4 March 2026

Planning Appeals Report – V1.0 ISSUED

Appeals Started between 12 November 2025 – 11 February 2026

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
25/00865/FUL 25 Edward Way Ashford TW15 3AY	12.11.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3374915 Internal alterations to facilitate change of use from dwelling house (Use Class C3) to house of multiple occupancy (HMO - use class Sui Generis) for 7 occupants
25/01091/FUL 60 Avondale Road Ashford TW15 3HT	12.11.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3375431 First floor rear extension to facilitate a change of use from a 6-person HMO (use class C4) to a 7-person HMO (use class sui generis)
25/00617/FUL	14.11.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3375469

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
116 - 118 Pavilion Gardens Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1HW			Proposed 2no. attached dwellings and extensions with alterations to existing dwellings with associated parking and amenity space following the demolition of the existing garages and the creation of a new vehicular crossover.
25/00490/FUL Plot 2 Sandhills Meadow Shepperton	18.11.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3375599 Installation of boundary fencing across the plot.
25/01013/HOU 66 Gordon Road Ashford TW15 3EU	19.11.2025	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/25/3375660 Retrospective application for the erection of a part two storey part single storey rear extension along with roof alterations to include hip to gable extension, the installation of a rear facing dormer and 2 no. roof lights within the front roof slope.
25/00295/FUL Stanwell Auto Services Limited Former Fordbridge Service Station Kingston Road	20.11.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3375737 Construction of building for the storage of cars with ancillary workshop in association with car sales
25/01114/FUL	10.12.2025	Written Representation	6002242 Roof alterations and extensions to create habitable roof space, with insertion of 1 no. front facing dormer and 1 no. rear facing dormer, erection of single storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. Changes to fenestration. Removal of

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
18 Wellington Road Ashford TW15 3RJ			the built flat roofed side extension, and subsequent conversion of the C3 dwellinghouse into an 8 person HMO (Sui-Generis) with associated amenities. (part retrospective)
25/01064/FUL 67 High Street Staines-upon- Thames TW18 4PU	11.12.2025	Written Representation	6002244 Change of Use of ground floor from vacant Bank to a proposed Bingo Hall
25/00995/HOU 8A Elizabethan Close Stanwell Staines-upon- Thames	15.01.2026	Fast Track Appeal	6002660 New roof including increase in ridge height and rear facing dormer to existing house 8A and two storey side extension with rear facing dormer.
25/01367/FUL 31 Junction Road Ashford TW15 1NJ	19.01.2026	Written Representation	6003440 Rear hip to gable extension, with 2 no. flank dormers, and 2 no. rooflights, to facilitate loft conversion into habitable space. Erection of a single storey rear extension. Changes to fenestration and extension of dropped kerb with new hardstanding on front driveway. All to facilitate the conversion of a C3 dwellinghouse into an 7-person HMO (Sui-Generis) with associated parking and amenities.
25/01172/FUL	19.01.2026	Written Representation	6003560 Extension and conversion of 26 Station Crescent, Ashford to create 3 residential flats, including a first-floor side extension with undercroft, two-storey rear extension, single-storey rear extension, internal alterations, and erection of a single-storey,

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
26 Station Crescent Ashford TW15 3HH			single- occupancy bungalow to the rear to provide a fourth dwelling, provision for two parking spaces, cycle storage, and bin storage.
25/00866/FUL 29-35 High Street Shepperton TW17 9AB	03.02.2026	Written Representation	6004503 The erection of an additional storey and rear extension to create 14 total residential units (including the re-configuration of 6 existing units) and internal alterations to Unit C on the ground floor.
25/01276/FUL 25 Edward Way Ashford TW15 3AY	10.02.2026	Written Representation	6004573 Internal alterations to facilitate the Change of use from C4 (6 person HMO) to Sui Generis (7 person HMO)

Appeal Decisions Made between 12 November 2025 – 11 February 2026

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
22/00231/ENF_A Land South East Of The Ranges (addressed As 1A Priory Stables) Chertsey Road	12.02.2024	Hearing	APP/Z3635/C/23/3335127 Appeal against serving of an Enforcement Notice. The carrying out on the land of building, engineering, mining or other operations in particular the laying of an area of hardstanding and a roadway on Green Belt land. Marked in blue on the attached plan and a change of use of the use of the land to the commercial storage of vehicles.	Appeal Dismissed	26.01.2026	The Inspector considered that the unauthorised development would cause substantial harm to the Green Belt, and additional harm to the character and appearance of the area. Having considered all matters raised in support of the development, he concluded collectively, they did not clearly outweigh the totality of the harm, and that very special circumstances did not exist. The Inspector varied the period for compliance to six months.
24/00203/FUL Land South East Of The Ranges	05.11.2024	Hearing	APP/Z3635/W/24/3348103 Change of use of the land for the stationing of 6 mobile static homes for Gypsy / Traveller	Appeal Dismissed	26.01.2026	The Inspector considered that the proposal would cause substantial harm to the Green Belt. He also considered there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area, Flood risk and intentional unauthorised development were additional

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
(addressed As 1A Priory Stables) Chertsey Road			occupation, with associated hard and soft landscaping, parking and roadway.			<p>issues against the scheme. Set against these harms was the very important consideration of the lack of provision for Traveller pitches within the Borough.</p> <p>Having considered all matters raised in support of the development he concluded that, collectively, they did not clearly outweigh the totality of the harm he had identified. Accordingly, very special circumstances did not exist, and the development was at odds with the Green Belt policy set out in the Framework. There was also conflict with Local Plan Policy GB1, although he attached little weight to that given its lack of alignment with current national policy. There was also conflict with Core Strategy policies EN1 and EN8 and LO1. The conflict with key development plan policies led him to conclude that there was conflict with the development plan as a whole.</p>
24/01289/CPD	03.03.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/X/25/3359327 Certificate of Lawfulness for the proposed	Appeal Dismissed	20.01.2026	Although the applicant argued that the single storey side and rear extension could extend 6 metres in depth, the Inspector concluded that it failed to meet the

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
18 Wellington Road Ashford TW15 3RJ			development of a single storey side/rear extension, extending beyond the rear elevation by 6 metres.			requirements of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. Specifically, paragraph (f) states that for a detached dwelling, an extension projecting beyond the rear wall must extend no more than 4 metres. Because the proposal exceeded this 4 metre limit, it did not qualify as permitted development.
25/00423/PAP Maynard Court Rosefield Road Staines-upon-Thames	11.07.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3368564 Prior Approval notification for the erection of two floors of residential flats on top of the existing detached block of flats. The proposed third and fourth floor extension would consist of 4 apartments per floor with associated parking and refuse facilities.	Appeal Dismissed	16.12.2025	The Inspector considered that the proposed works met permitted development requirements, although as part of the conditions of permitted development, prior approval must be sought in certain specified areas. In terms of external appearance, the Inspector noted that apart from tall five storey buildings at Dorchester Court and Claydon Court and a few four storey buildings, the vast majority of buildings fronting Kingston Road a 2 to 3 storeys. As such it was considered that there is a marked consistency in building heights. The Inspector considered nearby five storey buildings to be read as exceptions to the character and appearance of the

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						<p>area. Dorchester Court was also considered to be a 'landmark' building. As such, the Inspector considered that existing five storey buildings did not justify the harm of the scale and massing of the extended appeal building.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that the fenestration and materials would match the floors below but did not consider that this would overcome the adverse impacts of the proposed height.</p> <p>It was also acknowledged that the Council had not objected to the height of a previous proposal at the site, although the Inspector stated that they were not bound by that decision. The Inspector concluded that the building would cause significant harm to the character of the area contrary to the NPPF.</p> <p>However, notwithstanding concerns to the character of the area, harm was not found to the amenity of existing properties. Nevertheless, as a result of the harm to the character of the area the appeal was dismissed.</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
24/01299/FUL Land At Catherine Drive Sunbury-on- Thames TW16 7TF	17.07.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3369002 Erection of 6 no. two-storey affordable dwellings grouped into two buildings, with the creation of an enhanced public amenity space and retention of Urban Open Land and associated parking provision	Appeal Dismissed	12.12.2025	<p>The Inspector considered that the appeal scheme would introduce a significant amount of development to this open area resulting in a residential, developed appearance to the majority of the site.</p> <p>The size of the space would be significantly reduced, and it would be fragmented. It would therefore be a poorer provision than previously, and the Inspector was not satisfied that the public value in visual and functional terms would be equivalent to or better than the original site. The proposed development would result in the loss or deterioration of existing trees, including those with TPOs and the replacement planting would not be suitable to mitigate harm. The houses would be narrow and closely spaced with limited front garden space which would be cramped in this context and visually jarring against the spacious character of the area.</p> <p>As such, the Inspector concluded that the scheme would not secure a well-designed place or make an effective use of land in this regard. The appeal was therefore dismissed.</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
25/00704/PDH 271 Staines Road West Ashford TW15 1RT	13.08.2025	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/25/3369813 Prior approval notification for a single storey rear extension measuring 6 metres in depth beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house a maximum height of 3 metres and a height to the eaves of 3 metres.	Appeal Withdrawn	07.01.2026	N/A
25/00507/PDH 202 Kingston Road Staines-upon-Thames TW18 1PE	12.09.2025	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/25/3370765 Prior Approval Notification for a single storey rear extension extending 6 metres beyond the rear wall of the original dwellinghouse, with a maximum height of 3.85 metres and an eaves height of 3 metres. Following removal of existing conservatory and store.	Appeal Dismissed	19.11.2025	The appeal was dismissed due to unacceptable harm to neighboring amenity. The applicant proposed a full width rear extension, positioned along the boundary with No. 204, which was found to have a harmful depth, creating a sheer blank wall and a tunnelling effect when viewed from the neighbor's rear bi-fold doors. It would also loom over the patio, harming both internal outlook and outdoor amenity. The Inspector gave limited weight to the existing garage and a previously approved scheme, as these were either lower in height or significantly less deep. The proposal was found to conflict with Paragraph A.4(7) of Class A, Part 1 of the GPDO regarding

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						impact on adjoining amenity. Prior approval was therefore refused and the appeal dismissed.
25/00755/PDH 7 The Pines Sunbury-on-Thames TW16 6HT	10.09.2025	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/25/3371782 Prior approval notification for a single storey rear extension measuring 8 metres in depth beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling house a maximum height of 2.9 metres and a height to the eaves of 2.9 metres.	Appeal Allowed	18.11.2025	The Inspector considered that the appeal proposal, whilst not attached to the original rear wall, would clearly extend beyond the rear wall of the original dwelling, this is notwithstanding being attached to an existing extension.
24/01158/FUL 4 - 5 Broadway Kingston Road Staines-upon-Thames	22.09.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3372926 Erection of first and second storey rear extensions and alterations and extensions to roof including front rooflights to enlarge existing flats. Alterations to ground floor to provide enclosed refuse storage area.	Appeal Dismissed	05.12.2025	The Inspector considered that the proposed design would harmfully contrast with the existing elevations resulting in a discordant appearance. Moreover, the proposed extension would introduce significant bulk to upper floors which is unacceptably at odds with the design of the existing building. The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would therefore not have suitable regard to the locality and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to policy EN1 of the Core

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009)
25/00714/FUL 60 Avondale Road Ashford TW15 3HT	25.09.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3373359 First floor rear extension and conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation to facilitate a Change of use from a 6-person HMO (use class C4) to a 7-person HMO (use class sui generis)	Appeal Allowed	19.01.2026	The Inspector states that the proposal would provide good-quality accommodation with adequate communal space, as the enlarged kitchen/dining area and the dedicated outbuilding would offer functional social space for occupiers, and that the additional bedroom would meet required standards. He further states that the increase from six to seven occupants would not materially worsen noise impacts, given the existing use and lack of evidence of noise issues, and that the parking arrangements (including two formalised spaces and accessible location) would not harm highway safety or local parking provision. Overall, he concludes that the scheme complies with relevant policies, does not give rise to unacceptable impacts, and therefore planning permission should be granted subject to conditions.
25/00529/FUL	02.10.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3373844 Installation of 2 no. electric vehicle charging units	Appeal Dismissed	12.12.2025	The appeal was dismissed due to harm to neighboring residential amenity.

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
Parking Adjacent To 11 Denman Drive Ashford TW15 2AN			serving 4 no. spaces, with associated plant equipment. Including limited resurfacing works.			<p>The proposed EV charging points, including one operating 24 hours, would be located close to nearby homes in a predominantly residential area. The Inspector found that the development would increase vehicle movements, noise, headlights, and general disturbance, particularly during quieter evening and nighttime hours, effectively turning the car park into a 'destination in its own right.' Proposed mitigation measures were considered difficult to enforce, and insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that operational noise would be acceptable.</p> <p>Although the scheme would support sustainable transport objectives, these benefits were given limited weight and did not outweigh the harm. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policy EN1, and the appeal was dismissed.</p>
25/00806/RVC	10.10.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3373992 Variation to Condition 3 (Approved Plans) relating to planning permission 24/01542/FUL for roof alterations and extensions	Appeal Allowed	05.12.2025	The Inspector approved the variation to widen the single-storey side extension by 0.65m, reducing the set-in from the boundary. Despite SPD guidance favouring pitched roofs, the flat-roofed extension was considered small in scale, well-matched in materials, and not visually harmful. Given

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
18 Wellington Road Ashford TW15 3RJ			to create habitable roof space, with insertion of 1 no. front facing dormer and 1 no. rear facing dormer, erection of single storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. Changes to fenestration and extension of dropped kerb. All to facilitate the subdivision of the property into 2 no. flats. (1no. 2 bed and 1 no. 3 bed) with associated parking and amenity space. Changes to single storey side extension to reduce set in from boundary. (retrospective)			<p>the varied spacing and alterations along Wellington Road, it was not out of keeping with the area and complied with Policy EN1.</p> <p>Although the extension would be closer to No. 20 and affect outlook from one side-facing bedroom window, it would not breach the 45-degree guidance and was not found to cause significant harm. Overall, neighbor amenity impacts were limited.</p> <p>Concerns about parking, highway safety, boundary encroachment, HMO use, precedent, and public confidence were given little weight.</p> <p>The scheme was found to accord with the development plan as a whole, so the appeal was allowed.</p>
24/01112/FUL Land To North East Of Eco Park Charlton	09.10.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3374044 The construction of and operation of a Battery Energy Storage System of circa 100 megawatts electrical output with a total capacity of circa 200 megawatt hours,	Appeal Allowed	16.01.2026	<p>The Inspector considered that the proposed development would reduce the openness of the Green Belt spatially and visually, and would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is harmful by definition.</p> <p>However, against that harm, the Inspector placed substantial weight on the significant benefit of the proposed development with</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
Lane Shepperton			associated site access and partial cable route, with associated work			respect to its contribution to the mitigation of climate change and the regulation of electricity flows within the wider supply network. Therefore, the Inspector concluded that there were very special circumstances that clearly outweighed the harm to the Green Belt.
25/00956/PDH 23 Oaks Road Stanwell Staines-upon-Thames	24.10.2025	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/25/3374806 Prior Approval Notification for a single storey rear extension extending 6 metres beyond the rear wall of the original house, with a maximum height of 3.2 metres and a height of 3 metres to the eaves.	Appeal Allowed	01.12.2025	Given the relatively modest single storey height of the proposed extension, the Planning Inspector took the view that the amount of its built form would not be overbearing and harmful to the adjoining neighbouring property (no 21 Oaks Road). During the appeal stage, the neighbouring property also submitted a letter of no objection to the proposal. The Planning Inspector was in a view that the proposal would not conflict with Policy EN1 of the Spelthorne Borough Council Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document Adopted 2009. Consequently, the appeal was allowed.

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
25/01010/HOU 12 Dudley Road Ashford TW15 2LF	31.10.2025	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/25/3374969 Erection of part two-storey, part single storey rear extension and rear facing dormer.	Appeal Dismissed	02.12.2025	The Inspector considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property. He commented that the proposed rear dormer 'would undesirably appear as markedly at variance from the terraced dwellings alongside. Overall, the ungainly dormer and the increased scale of dwelling as whole at upper level would look 'top-heavy', alien, and be jarring on the eye.
25/00490/FUL Plot 2 Sandhills Meadow Shepperton	18.11.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/W/25/3375599 Installation of boundary fencing across the plot.	Appeal Dismissed	30.01.2026	The proposal required planning permission because the appeal site was subject to an Article 4 direction preventing the erection of gates, fences and other means of enclosures without planning permission. The Planning Inspector considered that the proposal does not meet any of the exceptions to inappropriate development in the GB and would affect the openness of the GB and be harmful to the character of the area. Consequently, the appeal was dismissed.

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
25/01013/HOU 66 Gordon Road Ashford TW15 3EU	19.11.2025	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/25/3375660 Retrospective application for the erection of a part two storey part single storey rear extension along with roof alterations to include hip to gable extension, the installation of a rear facing dormer and 2 no. roof lights within the front roof slope.	Appeal Dismissed	14.01.2026	<p>One where all the separate planning applications (PDH for single storey rear extension), HOU for two storey rear extension and CPD for a loft conversion were built under one development operation.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector took a view that all together with the part two storey part single storey rear extension, which adjoins the existing garage, the development significantly increased the scale and mass of the existing dwelling to the rear, thereby overwhelming its host. Therefore, the extensions formed discordant additions to the host dwelling and result in the scale of the extended house being out of character with the locality. Consequently, the appeal was dismissed.</p>
25/01064/FUL 67 High Street Staines-upon-Thames TW18 4PU	11.12.2025	Written Representation	6002244 Change of Use of ground floor from vacant Bank to a proposed Bingo Hall	Appeal Allowed	12.02.2026	<p>The Inspector acknowledged policies in the Council's Emerging Local Plan are capable of carrying weight, although determined the appeal on the basis of the adopted development plan, comprising the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (2009).</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						<p>The main issues identified were the effect of the proposed development on vitality and viability of Staines-upon-Thames, and the effect on living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.</p> <p>The Inspector noted that the site lies within the primary shopping area of the Town Centre and was formerly occupied by a bank.</p> <p>It was noted that policy TC2 pre-dates amendments to the Use Classes Order, although remains broadly consistent with the NPPF. However, as Policy TC2 is more restrictive than the NPPF this reduced the weight the Inspector attributed to it. It was also noted that Bingo Halls fall within the definition of town centre uses in the NPPF.</p> <p>It was accepted that a sui generis bingo hall use would not itself improve the quality and mix of uses within Class E. However, as the building is currently vacant, the Inspector considered that it would not undermine the aims of emerging policy EC2.</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						<p>The Inspector considered it realistic to consider that a bank may not return to the unit. The also commented that the bingo hall would introduce a leisure use that would generate footfall and activity at time when the centre might otherwise be quieter. The Inspector also considered that the bingo hall would contribute to spin-off trade.</p> <p>It was concluded that the proposal would not result in harm to the vitality and viability of Staines-upon-Thames Town Centre.</p> <p>In regard to living conditions, the Inspector noted that the 24-operation of the bingo hall would generate additional activity, which would most likely be experienced at night. However, a lobby area is included in the plans meaning patrons are unlikely to queue outdoors.</p> <p>It was noted that concerns have been raised regarding perceived risk of crime and anti-social behaviour, although there was no compelling evidence to demonstrate that the bingo hall would contribute to this. It was concluded that the proposal would not result in undue harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						<p>Negative social and public health impacts of gambling uses were noted. However, the Inspector commented that gambling is strictly regulated outside of the planning regime.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would accord with the Council's development plan and when considered against the policies in the Framework as a whole. The appeal was therefore allowed.</p>
<p>25/00617/FUL</p> <p>116-118 Pavilion Gardens, Staines-upon-Thames, Surrey TW18 1HW</p>	14.11.2025	Written Representation	<p>APP/Z3635/W/25/3375469</p> <p>Proposed 2no. attached dwellings and extensions with alterations to existing dwellings with associated parking and amenity space following the demolition of the existing garages and the creation of a new vehicular crossover.</p>	Appeal Dismissed	11.02.2026	<p>The Inspector considered that the proposed plot-subdivision would result in narrower plots than the prevailing plot</p> <p>width in the neighbouring properties. While appropriate gaps would remain to the side elevations of neighbouring properties, the narrower plots, together with the terraced nature of the proposed dwellings, would result in an unduly intense form of development that would appear cramped and at odds with the prevailing rhythm of the street scene. The Inspector considered that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						<p>appearance of the area, contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies</p> <p>Development Plan Document 2009 (DPD). The appeal was therefore dismissed.</p>

Current/Future Hearings/Inquiries

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Comments
25/00208/TPO Rowland Hill Almshouses Feltham Hill Road Ashford	14.08.2025	Hearing	APP/TPO/Z3635/10587 TPO264/2020- T1 (indicated within the submitted location plan as Pine Tree)- Monterey Pine- to fell (no work proposed to the Yew Tree- T2).			Waiting for the Inspector to publish dates.