



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/17/3181444

Merle Cottage, 12 Lyncroft Gardens, Ewell KT17 1UR

- 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 Alex Wroe against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00007/FLH, dated 15 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of existing single storey lean to garage structure and conservatory to the rear. To be replaced with a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Additional works include internal remodelling to create additional bedroom, open plan living space and more generously proportioned bedroom accommodation. Replacement of existing fenestration to the rear elevation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing single storey lean to garage structure and conservatory to the rear. To be replaced with a two storey side extension and a part single and part two storey rear extension. Additional works include internal remodelling to create additional bedroom, open plan living space and more generously proportioned bedroom accommodation. Replacement of existing fenestration to the rear elevation at Merle Cottage, 12 Lyncroft Gardens, Ewell KT17 1UR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00007/FLH, dated 15 March 2017, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 042-A-01-050 Proposed Block/Location Plan; 042-A-01-100 Proposed Floor Plans; 042-A-01-105 Proposed Elevations; and 042-A-01-106 Proposed Sections.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used by the appellant does not include a reference to part of the rear extension being of two storeys. This is something that the Council has included in the description of the development that it has used, given the details shown on the application drawings. I consider, for reasons of accuracy, that a reference to the two storey element

of the rear extension should be made in the description of the development and I have therefore included this in my formal decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the two storey side extension on the character and appearance of 12 Lyncroft Gardens (No 12) and the Ewell Village Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

4. The development would involve the demolition of a side garage and a rear conservatory and the construction of a two storey side extension and a part single and a part two storey rear extension and the replacement of the doors and windows in the rear elevation. No 12 is a detached house in a street of fifteen individually designed houses dating from the 1930s. Lyncroft Gardens is a residential street in the extensive mixed use CA.
5. The side extension's front elevation would be set back 3.0 metres from No 12's principal front (gable) elevation and it would be inset from the boundary shared with No 13 by 1.0 metre. Given No 12's siting within its plot the side extension's front elevation would be 15.5 metres from the back edge of the footway in Lyncroft Gardens¹. Having regard to the side extension's siting, scale and height I consider that it would have an appearance that would be subservient to No 12. I also consider that the side extension's appearance would be respectful of No 12's design, including the large front gable.
6. No 12 occupies a discrete position in Lyncroft Gardens, with it being sited on one side of the radial turning head, completely behind No 13. The side extension, given its siting, would also be discretely located in the streetscene, with it only being visible from positions directly in front of No 12 or a little to the south west or west. Concern has been raised that the side extension would intrude into the green gap between Nos 12 and 13, given that a two storey addition would replace a single storey structure. However, Lyncroft Gardens is characterised by a relatively compact layout, with there being limited space between each property. I therefore consider that closure of the space between Nos 12 and 13 would have little effect on the streetscene's character. While there would be some loss of the views of the greenery (trees/shrubs) in No 12's rear garden, I consider that effect would not be significant, given the current limited views of that greenery. I therefore consider that the CA's appearance would be preserved. The CA's character, in land use terms, would also be preserved because the side extension would affect a house in a residential street, forming part of the mixed use CA.
7. I therefore conclude that the side extension would not harm the character and appearance of No 12 or the CA and that there would be no conflict with Policies DM8, DM9 and DM10 of the Epsom and Ewell Development Management Policies Document of 2015. That is because the CA, as a heritage asset, would be 'conserved' and the design and siting of the side extension would be respectful of the townscape in Lyncroft Gardens and the character and appearance of No 12.

¹ All dimensions taken from section 2 of the appellant's appeal statement

Conditions

8. Apart from the standard time limit condition, I find it necessary that the development should be built to accord with the submitted plans for certainty. A condition is also necessary requiring the development to be constructed with external materials matching those of No 12, to safeguard the appearance of this property and the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR