

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 April 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/17/3169740

42 Longdown Lane North, Epsom KT17 3JQ

- 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 Jonathon Graham against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00917/FLH, dated 15 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2016.
The development proposed is described as: *"Install double glazing to bedroom and living room windows at the front of the house. Build a small garden wall at front of property. Create a carriage (in/out) driveway"*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Higher Green/Longdown Lane Conservation Area and its effect on the appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a handsome detached 2-storey house. It is located in a residential street comprising houses of similar age and appearance which are set back from the road beyond grass verges and mature vegetation giving the street scene a notably verdant and spacious appearance. This is a key attribute of the character and appearance of the Higher Green/Longdown Lane Conservation Area and a matter to which I attach substantial weight.
 4. The proposal would include the formation of a second vehicular access together with the erection of a front boundary wall with railings above and piers to either side of the entrances. This would result in the loss of soft landscaping, including part of the grass verge and mature planting next to the property's front boundary and a significant increase in hard surfacing at the front of the property. This, together with the boundary wall and railings, would have a harmful effect on the street scene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
 5. I note that the proposal would enable the appellant to exit the property in forward gear as opposed to reversing into the road. There is however nothing
-

before me to demonstrate that there is not sufficient space for a car to turn around and leave the property in forward gear at present. In addition, if reversing is necessary, I note that there is clear visibility on the road due to the wide verges. For these reasons I attribute limited weight to the suggested highway safety benefits of the in/out driveway.

6. The proposal would also include the replacement of the metal-framed leaded light windows in the front elevation with UPVC windows. In the absence of any drawings or illustrations to demonstrate that the proposed windows would be in keeping with the appearance of the property it must be concluded that, due to their design and materials, they would represent unsympathetic and therefore harmful alterations to the host property.
7. I note that planning permission has been granted for replacement windows in other properties in the Conservation Area. However, as each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to its particular design and local context I attribute limited weight to these schemes.
8. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the appearance of the host property and would fail to preserve the character of the Conservation Area. It therefore fails to comply with Policies DM8, DM9 and DM10 Development Management Policies Document (2015) which, amongst other matters, seeks development that is compatible with local character and distinctiveness and enhances the historic environment. There is also conflict with the aims of Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) which seeks the protection and enhancement or conservation areas.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR