

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022

**by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 08 FEBRUARY 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/21/3280846**

**3 Pine Hill, Epsom KT18 7BH**

- 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 Huckle against the decision of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 21/00434/FLH, dated 10 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and storage unit and erection of a two storey side extension and new rear single storey bi-fold bay to replace existing patio window bay.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and storage unit and erection of a two storey side extension and new rear single storey bi-fold bay to replace existing patio window bay at 3 Pine Hill, Epsom KT18 7BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00434/FLH, dated 10 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3PH-100; 3PH-101; 3PH-102; 3PH-103; 3PH-104; 3PH-105.
  - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the 2 storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. The application site is located along the eastern side of Pine Hill, within the Woodcote Estate. The area comprises a private estate of mainly detached houses, many dating from the inter-war period. The houses vary in their styles

and appearance. The appeal property is an inter-war period two storey detached house. The property been previously extended to the side, where the appeal scheme would be located. The house has a chalet style roof with front dormer window on the existing two-storey side extension.

4. The proposal would see the demolition of an existing single storey structure at the side and replacement with a 2 storey element, constructed in a similar style as the chalet-roofed section, referred to above. The 2 storey side element would be 1m from the side boundary with No 1 Pine Hill.
5. The Council has objected to the proximity of the proposed extension to the side boundary and the alleged failure of the proposed extension to be subservient to the main building. In relation to the distance between the proposal and the boundary, this would be similar to a number of other properties within the area that I observed and which have been drawn to my attention by the appellant. In this respect, I consider that the proposal would not appear out of place.
6. In relation to the issue of subservience, the proposal would incorporate a chalet-style roof and modest front dormer window, in the same style as the existing extension at this property. Although the proposed ridge would be the same height as the existing house, its design wherein the roof-slope continues down to the ground floor level, with a small dormer, means that the proposal would be subservient to the existing house when taken as a whole. In addition, I observed a number of properties which appear to have been extended without incorporating a lowered ridge line and appear more dominant than the proposal would, in my judgement.
7. I have noted the Council's reference to its Supplementary Design Guidance from 2004 but I find that the proposal would have no harmful effects on the surrounding area. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document.
8. In relation to conditions, I agree with the suggestions from the Council and so that the extension has an acceptable appearance and is built in accordance with the permission, I shall include conditions relating to the external materials of the extension and a requirement that it should be built in accordance with the approved drawings.

## **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

*T Wood*

INSPECTOR