



Planning Committee

27 May 2026

Planning Appeals Report – V1.0 ISSUED

Appeals Started between 16 April 2026 – 14 May 2026

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
26/00011/RVC 35 Park Road Ashford TW15 1EX	17.04.2026	Written Representation	6008213 Removal of Condition 4 (restricts the use of the extended property to Use Class C3 only) relating to planning application 25/01088/HOU
25/01495/HOU 2 Cumberland Road Ashford TW15 3BX	28.04.2026	Fast Track Appeal	6008311 Demolition of garage and erection of self-contained annex with provision of 1 off street parking space. (as shown on plan no's P0, P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8 rec'd 19.01.2026).

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature
25/01403/FUL Shepperton Studios Studios Road Shepperton	08.05.2026	Written Representation	6008636 Retention of 30m slimline lattice tower on ballast grillage enclosed in a compound fence

Appeal Decisions Made between 16 April 2026 – 14 May 2026

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
22/00198/ENF 58 Green Lane Shepperton	04.03.2025	Written Representation	APP/Z3635/C/25/3359636 Appeal against serving of an Enforcement Notice. The material change of use of a garage and the land to use for the storage of builder's tools and materials.	Notice deemed a nullity by Planning Inspector	01.05.2026	N/A
25/00906/HOU 48 Courtfield Road Ashford TW15 1JR	06.11.2025	Fast Track Appeal	APP/Z3635/D/25/3374005 Retrospective application for the erection of a rear conservatory (As shown on plans: Location Plan received 11.07.2025 and YSG/48/2025/A; YSG/48/2025/B received 16.07.2025)	Appeal Allowed	06.05.2026	The inspector states although the cumulative depth of extensions on the site exceeds the 3m guideline set out in the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), that a departure from this guidance is justified. This is because the conservatory's modest height, limited width, and glazed elevations ensure it remains clearly subordinate to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						inspector found that the development does not harm the character or appearance of the area, as the surrounding context features varied garden sizes and outbuildings. Finally, the inspector was satisfied that the proposal causes no harmful loss of light or outlook for neighbouring occupiers.
25/01114/FUL 18 Wellington Road Ashford TW15 3RJ	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 the built flat roofed side extension, and subsequent conversion of the C3 dwellinghouse into an 8 person HMO (Sui-	Appeal Dismissed	16.04.2026	The Planning Inspector dismissed the appeal for extensions and associated conversion into an 8-person HMO, finding that although the proposed extensions and roof alterations were acceptable, the intensified HMO use would harm the character of the quiet residential street and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The Inspector concluded that occupation by eight unrelated individuals would generate significantly greater comings and goings, noise, disturbance, visitors and parking pressure than a typical family

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
			Generis) with associated amenities. (part retrospective)			dwelling or the previously approved flat conversion scheme. Particular weight was given to the recently adopted Article 4 Direction removing permitted development rights for C3-to-C4 HMO conversions, meaning the appellant could no longer rely on a fallback position for a smaller HMO. While the scheme would provide some additional affordable housing choice, these benefits were considered limited and insufficient to outweigh the identified harm, resulting in conflict with Policies PS2 and E4 of the Spelthorne Local Plan.
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. (As shown on plan no's 0052 C2 rec'd 03.10.2025 and	Appeal Dismissed	24.04.2026	This Inspector agreed that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host building, disrupting the established eaves line and eroding the subservient appearance of the appeal property, resulting in a discordant and intrusive form of development that would fail to

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
			0026 C3, 0016 C2, 0015 C1, 0012 C3, 0053 C1, 0010 C3, 0011 C3, 0021 C2 all rec'd 08.08.2025)			respect the uniform character of the host building and wider terrace. Furthermore, he considered the dormer would result in incongruous and disproportionate addition to the host dwelling.
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.	Appeal Dismissed	27.04.2026	The Planning Inspector dismissed the appeal for the extension and associated conversion into an 8-person HMO, concluding that although many of the physical alterations could proceed under existing lawful development certificates, the proposed use would fail to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupants. The Inspector found that several bedrooms would suffer from poor outlook, privacy and natural light, while the communal kitchen and outdoor amenity space would be inadequate and cramped for eight residents. Although concerns about harm to neighbouring amenity and the

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						character of the area were largely mitigated by the fallback position allowing similar extensions, the poor quality of living conditions within the HMO carried significant weight. Despite the Council's lack of a five-year housing land supply and the modest benefit of additional shared accommodation, the Inspector concluded that the adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits, and the appeal was therefore dismissed.
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.	Appeal Dismissed	06.05.2026	The Inspector noted that relatively tall buildings of varying designs front the High Street and considered that the proposed fourth storey would be broadly comparable with the heights of existing buildings. The proposed setback was considered break up the building's massing and the extension was considered to have a subordinate appearance.

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						<p>The Inspector considered that the appeal proposal related entirely to the character and appearance of the High Street and represented a modest improvement.</p> <p>In terms of future occupants, the Inspector noted that there was an amenity area above the existing flats. It was noted that seven of the proposed flats would share a communal garden, and the Inspector considered that there were considerable differences between the existing amenity space and the proposed, with the proposed falling below the standard set out in the Design Code. The size of the garden was considered to be insufficient and would be a cramped and crowded space. The Inspector did not consider that nearby green spaces would mitigate this shortfall.</p> <p>However, the Inspector considered that the scheme had</p>

Case Ref & Address	Date Started	Procedure	Appeal Ref & Nature	Decision	Decision Date	Inspectors' Comments
						<p>an acceptable impact upon the amenity of the occupiers of no.13 Manor Farm Avenue and would have provided an acceptable level of parking provision.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Inspector considered that there would be a modest improvement to the character of the area and the proposal would contribute to the Council's Housing Land Supply. However, this was not considered to outweigh the harm to living conditions for future occupiers by reasons of shortfalls in amenity space, and the appeal was 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.