



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2020

by R. Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/20/3250445

42 Briarwood Road, Stoneleigh KT17 2LY

- 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 Ms N White against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01532/FLH, dated 18 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed 1st floor side extension with single storey rear extension including loft conversion with new front and rear roof dormers with skylights to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. No. 42 Briarwood Road (No.42) forms the left-hand half of a pair of attractive two storey semi-detached houses located on the northern side of Briarwood Road. No.42 and its adjoining pair (No.40 Briarwood Road) has a simple hipped cat-slide roof form with dormer windows to first floor accommodation. They have a broadly symmetrical appearance, save the attached garage for No.40 which is set further back from the front building line than No.42. Although some properties on Briarwood Road have been extended, and the houses differ in style, roof level extensions typically appear subordinate to the original roof and house. The result is a streetscene characterised by pleasingly balanced pairs of semi-detached houses which has a rhythm of development. Nos. 40 and 42 positively contribute to this character.

5. The first-floor side extension above the ground floor garage and the hip to gable extension would significantly increase the size of the house and fundamentally alter its shape. The guidance in the Council's *Householder Applications: Supplementary Planning Guidance* (2004) (SPG), although recognising it is not inflexible, says that generally roof ridges should not be raised in level on semi-detached houses. Whilst set slightly off the flank elevation at first floor, at odds with the SPG, the ridgeline of the gable would meet the original roofline and therefore fails to appear subordinate to the original house.
6. The rear dormer window would extend much of the width of the rear elevation, almost flush with its gable. Although part finished in hanging tiles to match the existing roof, the dormer would be partially visible from the public realm of Briarwood Road. In combination with the gable, it would result in a scale and bulk of extension that would appear an unduly prominent and incongruous addition to the host house. It would also completely unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair and would upset the rhythm of development described above.
7. My attention has been drawn to examples of similar hip to gable extensions in the local area. Notably, No.141 Waverley Road (No.141) is the same original house type as No.42 Briarwood Road and appears to have been extended in an almost identical way to the proposal before me. I note that this extension pre-dates the adoption of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council's Development Management Policies Document (2015) (DMPD) but not the SPG. However, I saw on my site visit that No.141 has the same issues I find above in terms of the scale, bulk and prominence of the roof and its unbalancing impact on its attached neighbour. It therefore only serves to reinforce my conclusions that the first-floor side and rear dormer extension would cause harm to both the host house and the character and appearance of the area. I do not have full details and circumstances of the other examples put to me and in any event must consider this appeal on its individual site characteristics and merits.
8. Consequently, I find the proposals would conflict with DMDP Policies DM9 and DM10 and the SPG which seek to ensure that the design of residential extensions is sympathetic to that of the original dwelling and the local character of the area and should respect local scale, roof form and massing. There would also be conflict with the design guidelines in Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework for these reasons.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR