



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 June 2021

by Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/D/21/3269975

The Coach House, 180 Chesterfield Road, Ashford TW15 3PU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Cramp against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01054/HOU, dated 11 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal with respect to flood risk.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a part two / part single-storey dwelling which is set-back somewhat from Chesterfield Road. It is common ground that the existing ground floor extension at The Coach House was built over a culvert, over 10 years ago. The Environment Agency have expressed their opinion that the proposal would be likely to adversely affect the construction and stability of the culvert which would compromise its function, thereby potentially causing the structure to fail, which would increase the risk of flooding to nearby properties.
4. The appellant has stated that a foundation pad and beam arrangement was used to bridge over the culvert, and has submitted a photograph which shows that the culvert was bridged in the ground prior to the ground floor extension being built. Whilst this evidence is noted, no structural calculations or other relevant technical evidence has been provided with regards to whether the structural integrity of the culvert would be affected by proposed development. As such, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the culvert, thereby increasing the risk of flooding.
5. I therefore find that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect with respect to flood risk. The proposal would conflict with Policy LO1 of the Core Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document (adopted 2009) which aims to reduce flood risk and its adverse effects on people and property in Spelthorne. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which provides that, amongst other things, decision-makers should ensure that flood risk is not increased.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR