



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/19/3240392

113 Pams Way, Ewell KT19 0HW

- 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 Paul Burke against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01047/FLH dated 13 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear / side extension and hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions, installation of 2 x front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Procedural / Preliminary Matters

4. The description of the development on the planning application form does not describe all the elements of the proposed development. I have taken the wording used on the appeal forms and the Council's decision, in the above header as it more accurately describes the proposal.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located on the corner of Pams Way and Oakland Way. Opposite the appeal property is the entrance to the Hogsmill Riverside area of open space. The local area is residential, typified by pairs of hipped roofed semi-detached dwellings similar in style and design to the appeal property. It was noted during my site visit that a number of dwellings in the area have been altered or extended, although the roofs of the majority of the dwellings along Pams Way and Oakland Way appeared generally consistent in appearance.

6. The site's location, on a corner plot and opposite the entrance to an area of open space, means it is in a prominent position with the front and side of the property being highly visible. The proposed hip to gable roof extension would be visible from the front and side and would alter the shape and style of the roof, giving it a bulky and discordant appearance that would be out of keeping with the appearance of the existing dwelling. Whilst the appellant suggests that the impact would be minimal as the gable would only be across the width of the original roof and that the set back from Oakland Way, the building line and the sloping roofs of the existing extensions would be retained, this would not sufficiently mitigate the conspicuous and incongruous nature of the alteration.
7. It would also result in a noticeably unbalanced appearance with the attached neighbouring property. The appeal property has been extended previously so the pair of semi-detached dwellings are not identical. However, the previous extensions are more in keeping with the form of the original pair, particularly in terms of their hipped roofs, and do not unacceptably upset the visual balance of the properties in the way the roof alterations would. The change in visual symmetry would be unacceptably harmful.
8. My attention has been drawn to examples of properties in the vicinity that feature hip to gable roof alterations. Although these examples are similar, the proposal before me would not have the same appearance and, given its position on the corner and visibility in both street scenes, would be more prominent and noticeable compared to any of the examples provided.
9. The proposed development includes a single storey rear/side extension and rear dormer and the Council raise no concerns in respect of these elements of the development. I have no reason to consider otherwise.
10. Nonetheless, I conclude, for the above reasons, that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and area and be contrary to Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy 2007 which states that development should reinforce local distinctiveness and complement the attractive characteristics of the Borough. It is also contrary to Development Management Policies Document (September 2015) Policy DM9, which seeks to ensure proposals make a positive contribution to the Borough's visual character and appearance, and Policy DM10 which requires development to respect the local distinctiveness of a street or area including its roof forms.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR