



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

by V Goldberg BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3635/W/23/3333645

34 Village Way, Ashford, Surrey, TW15 2LB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohammed Ali against the decision of Spelthorne Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01073/FUL.
 - The development proposed is extension of driveway to provide additional parking, including change of use from amenity land to residential parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Village Way is a tree lined road with grass verges running adjacent to footpaths and hedges demarcating front boundaries. The appeal site is located on a bend in the road whereby larger grassed areas are positioned between the footpath and the properties. These areas, positively contribute to the verdant character of the road. Parking access to driveways is provided by linear hard surfaced areas between the grassed sections. Vehicle parking predominately takes place on driveways or on the road, and there is also evidence of ad hoc parking on the verges.
4. The proposal would result in the loss of a section of the grassed area to accommodate a parking bay. Whilst only around 5% of the landscaping would be lost in this location, the installation of a hard surface would nonetheless erode the positive contribution that the grassed area makes to the verdant character of the road. The consolidated presence of a vehicle, in an area clearly not originally designed for parking would appear incongruous in this setting.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to the fact that the Council does not rely on policy EN4 (Provision of Open Space and Sport Recreation Facilities). Instead, its case focusses on compliance with Policy EN1 and the visual impact of the proposal. My assessment has focussed on the visual impact of the proposed development and has identified harm.
6. For the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. The

proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy EN1 of the Core Strategy and Policies DPD 2009 in so far as it requires development to make a positive contribution to the street scene and character of the area.

Other Matters

7. The appellant argues that the existing arrangements do not provide sufficient parking for the occupiers and the proposal would relieve pressure for on street parking and address potential highway safety impacts. However, these benefits do not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area identified.

Conclusion

8. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations before me do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

V Goldberg

INSPECTOR