



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2020

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06/01/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/20/3251369
259 Kingston Road, Ewell KT19 0BN

- 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 and Mrs Uddin against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00109/FLH, dated 22 January 2020 was refused by notice dated 17 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the rebuilding of part of the garage, a ground floor rear extension, a side extension and a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal in the Council's officer report includes a first floor rear extension. However, having regard to the submitted drawings and page 2 of the appellants' statement, this scheme does not include any such proposal. Whilst I note the appellants' concerns regarding the Council's consideration of the application, I have dealt with the proposal on its merits.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair and the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Kingston Road is a long highway with a range of property types. The dwellings along this side of it close to the appeal site are predominantly arranged as two storey semi-detached pairs. Whilst many have been altered, their front faces typically share features such as prominent two storey projections, and a principally hipped roof form. This, together with their fairly even spacing, and their set back from the road, provides a rhythm and a sense of harmony to the streetscene.
5. Unlike the host dwelling, its attached neighbour at No 257 has a large side and rear-facing dormer window. Although the dormer partially unbalances the appearance of this semi-detached pair, as it is set well back on the roof, its impact on the streetscene is limited, and viewed from the front the building still has a principally hipped roof form.

6. As illustrated at page 5 of the appellants' statement and its appendices, roof and other alterations are not without precedent along Kingston Road and other roads in the area, and there are many non-identical semi-detached pairs.
7. However, this proposal's hip to gable extension would be markedly at odds with the fairly consistent and locally distinctive roof form of the semi-detached properties along this stretch of the streetscene. It would also unbalance this semi-detached pair.
8. Additionally, the side extension's tall and narrow front wall would have an eaves not far off the host property's ridge line, and well above its eaves. Consequently, notwithstanding its significant set back, it would significantly change this building's shape, and would create an awkward junction, which would relate poorly to the host's form.
9. Whilst matching materials are proposed, and many original features would be retained, for the above reasons, these parts of the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair, and the streetscene.
10. The Council does not object to the proposed single storey rear extension which would be similar to that approved under Ref: 19/01147/PDE. The dormer would be to the rear, where it would not be prominent in the streetscene. Rear dormers and single storey rear extensions are not uncommon in this area. Consequently, those elements of the scheme would be acceptable.
11. However, as this scheme includes a side extension, it differs from what could be constructed in accordance with a Lawful Development Certificate (Ref: 19/01136/CLP). That Certificate does not therefore lead me to reach a different conclusion regarding this scheme's harmful impact.
12. I have also had regard to a recently dismissed appeal on the site (Ref: APP/P3610/D/20/3245919). That scheme differs from this in that it included a first floor rear extension. However, for the above reasons, I agree with that Inspector's conclusion that the side extension and the hip to gable extension would represent an incongruous addition.
13. The proposal would conflict with Policy DM 10 of the Epsom and Ewell Development Management Policies Document 2015 and Policy CS 5 of the Epsom and Ewell Core Strategy 2007. Amongst other things, and in general terms, they require all development to be of a high quality design, which respects the character and reinforces the local distinctiveness of an area. It would also conflict with the broadly similar stance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

14. Whilst the appellants refer to security improvements, including the installation of lighting, security locks and CCTV; and sustainability benefits such as triple glazing and an energy efficient boiler, this scheme is not the only way in which those could be achieved.
15. The benefit of providing a fully adaptable space suitable for later years living, does not justify allowing this harmful development.

Conclusion

16. The scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair and the area. It would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. Having regard to all other matters raised, including a representation by a neighbour, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR