



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/20/3259347

36 Hamilton Close, Epsom KT19 8RG

- 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 & Mrs Noble against the decision of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00875/FLH, dated 22 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as, "Proposed revised application in full for a single storey side extension, single storey rear extension, raising of the main roof ridge incorporating rear roof dormer extension and installation of two rooflights to front roof slope".
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. It is clear from the Council's decision that it has no objection to the single storey side extension. I have no evidence before me to reach a contrary view to the Council in this regard and therefore the consideration of this appeal focuses on the effect of the single storey rear extension, and the raising of the main roof ridge incorporating a rear roof dormer extension and the installation of two rooflights to the front roof slope.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site contains a two-storey detached dwelling set-back from the road by a small front garden. No 36 Hamilton Close ('No 36') is an attractive property with a front gable that emanates from its sloping roof.
6. Hamilton Close predominantly consists of detached and semi-detached dwellings, and there is a notable degree of diversity in terms of their designs and materials used. Despite this, the individual properties generally have the

appearance of authenticity that is in-keeping with their original designs. Similarly, No 36 is legible and coherent with respect to its overall appearance.

7. Although there would be some overall reduction in the scale of the roof, the new front façade created by the proposal would appear overly bulky on this attractive property, significantly altering its appearance. Moreover, whilst gable features are a characteristic of the area, the one proposed and the window arrangement below would not reflect those within nearby properties and it would appear contrived and would not harmonise adequately with the host property. The combined bulk and massing of these elements of the proposal would dominate the host property, destroying its legible and modest appearance.
8. As a consequence, harm would result to the character and appearance of the host property. The contribution that it makes to the character of the streetscene would be significantly eroded and it follows that harm to the character and appearance of the area would occur as a result of this aspect of the proposal. I observed No 34 Hamilton Close, but that property has retained its pleasant appearance. This would not be the case with the appeal proposal. As such, No 34 is not directly comparable, and it does not change my findings.
9. The rear elements of the proposal would be largely screened from public vantage points and would not unduly contrast with nearby properties. Thus, those elements would adequately assimilate with the character and appearance of the area. However, this would not be sufficient to overcome the harm identified above, arising from the other aspects of the proposal.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy (adopted 2007), and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document (adopted 2015) which collectively support proposals which make a positive contribution to the Borough's visual character and appearance. There would also be conflict with the advice in the Householder Applications: Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) that a good scheme should be well-related to the original building.

Other Matters

11. It is recognised that this appeal proposal follows a previous application and dialogue with the Council, and that no objections relating to this appeal have been received from neighbours. However, these are neutral matters, which do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
12. The proposal would improve the living accommodation available to the appellants. However, as this would mainly be a private benefit, this has been given limited weight.
13. Overall, I find that the matters advanced in support of the proposal, do not, either individually or collectively, outweigh the harm identified, nor the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR