



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2022

by J Downs BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/22/3294832

84 West Street, Ewell KT17 1XH

- 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 Bowman against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01767/FLH, dated 5 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing garage and erection of a proposed single storey front extension. Including the extension of the existing first floor front with side dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and erection of a proposed first floor front extension with proposed side dormers at 84 West Street, Ewell KT17 1XH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01767/FLH, dated 5 November 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: 001 - Site Location Plan; 020 - Proposed Ground Floor Plan; 021 - Proposed First Floor Plan; 022 - Proposed Roof Plan; 023 - Proposed Front & Rear Elevations; and 024 - Proposed Side Elevations.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be constructed entirely of the materials as detailed on the schedule of materials on the planning application form.
 - 4) The proposed above ground floor windows in the south-western elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass of no less than obscurity level 3 and permanently fixed shut, unless the parts of the windows which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and shall thereafter be permanently retained as such.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. West Street is characterised by predominantly detached dwellings, set in generous plots with the dwellings typically set back from the public highway. There is no prevailing style or appearance to the dwellings which gives the surrounding area a distinctive character. The appeal property is a detached bungalow which is unassuming in the street scene due to its modest scale and straightforward design.
4. The appeal proposal would introduce new elements to the dwelling with the first floor extension to the front, changes to the shape of the roof and views of the side dormers. This would substantially increase the mass of the house and would significantly alter the shape and appearance of the roof. However, given the simplicity of the design of the existing dwelling, and prominence of the hipped roof, these works would have an acceptable impact on the appearance of the host property.
5. Furthermore, the adjacent properties have the appearance of prominent roofs due to the use of hanging tiles at first floor level. The appeal proposal would not appear disproportionate in relation to the overall scale of the surrounding dwellings. The changes to the roof of the appeal property would not appear incongruous in this context or prominent in the street scene due to the position of the dwelling set back in the plot.
6. I note the advice contained within the Householder Applications: Supplementary Planning Guidance dated January 2004 (SPG). However the weight I attach to it is reduced in light of the distinctive characteristics of the appeal site and its surroundings, the age of the SPG and changes to the permitted development regime since it was developed.
7. The Council did not raise any concerns with regard to the single storey front extension. I did not observe anything during my site visit that would result in my reaching a different conclusion.
8. In relation to this main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area in accordance with the Core Strategy adopted 2007 Policies CS 1 and CS 5 which seek high quality development that complements the attractive characteristics of the Borough, the Development Management Policies Document adopted September 2015 Policies DM9 and DM10 which require development to be compatible with local character.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested several conditions should the appeal be allowed. I have had regard to these in light of the advice contained within the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. The standard time limit and approved plans conditions should be imposed to define the terms of the permission. Materials were specified on the application form, and compliance with that should also be secured by condition to ensure the appearance of the development would be acceptable.
11. The Council has also suggested a condition requiring the first floor windows in the south-western elevation to be obscure glazed and non-opening. This is considered reasonable given their proximity to the adjacent property and as

the windows are proposed to serve bathrooms but I have amended the wording in the interests of precision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme complies with the development plan. As such, the appeal is allowed.

J Downs

INSPECTOR