



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: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/19/3240572
100 Ruxley Lane, Ewell KT19 0HY

- 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 Lee Dunn against the decision of the Council of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00960/FLH, dated 6 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension with loft conversion and dormer extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and rear extension with loft conversion and dormer extension to rear at 100 Ruxley Lane, Ewell KT19 0HY in accordance with the application, Ref 19/00960/FLH, dated 6 August 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: TD 2356 / 101 Rev C (dated Dec 17) and unnumbered plan at 1:100 scale dated 06/08/19 Rev A (Proposed Street Scene).

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.

Procedural Matters

3. Planning permission already exists at the appeal property for a two storey side and rear extension with a loft conversion and dormer extension to the rear (17/01456/FLH). It appears that the difference between the scheme subject of the existing planning permission and the proposal is the larger rear dormer and a change in the design of the proposed roof from a hipped roof to a 'Sussex gable'. As such I have focussed my consideration on these aspects of the

proposal. At the time the site visit was undertaken, building work to construct the extensions was at an advanced stage.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on a mainly residential road. The pairs of semi-detached dwellings along Ruxley Lane generally feature similar designs and materials in their pairs, although there are a number of examples where variations in style and design occur. Also a number of dwellings along Ruxley Lane have extensions and a variety of roof styles are present.
6. It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in a different roof shape at the appeal property and some degree of visual imbalance with the attached neighbouring property would occur. However, the Sussex gable would not exceed the existing roof height and would be modest in scale, and so it would not appear dominant when viewed from Ruxley Lane. The use of matching materials would also help to assimilate it with the existing roof. Overall, I consider that it would not be so disruptive to the appearance and character of the pair of dwellings as to be unacceptable. Nor, given the variety of roof designs that exist along Ruxley Lane, would it be detrimental to the street scene.
7. The proposed rear dormer roof extension would be flat roofed and set in from the side of the dwelling. Whilst the proposed dormer is substantial and will add additional bulk and mass to the dwelling, it would not overly dominate the rear of the dwelling when considered in the context of the proposed two storey side extension and would not be visible from the public highway.
8. Overall, it is my view that there would be no significant difference between the approved development which, it appears, is being implemented, and the proposed development insofar as the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene is concerned.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. It would accord with Policy DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document (September 2015) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure proposals make a positive contribution to the Borough's visual character and appearance and contribute to the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area. Whilst Policy DM10 does reference roof form as an element contributing to character and local distinctiveness that should be respected, maintained or enhanced, in this case no harm has been found to occur from the proposed alterations to the roof.
10. The proposal is also not contrary to guidance within the Householder Applications: Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) which states that an existing hipped end may be changed to a Sussex type gable, if the street character is not adversely affected by asymmetrical roofs. The guidance goes on to state that the new half gable should be at least 2.5m away from the plot

side boundary and also at least 5m away from the opposing wall of the adjoining property. The proposal would adhere to all these criteria.

Conditions

11. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR