



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: 3 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/22/3302255

37 Dorling Drive, Ewell, Surrey KT17 3BH

- 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 Rob Carey against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00423/FLH, dated 30 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is two-storey front extension, single-storey side infill extension, single-storey rear extension, entrance porch, new roof, rear dormers and new windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two-storey front extension, single-storey side infill extension, single-storey rear extension, entrance porch, new roof, rear dormers and new windows at 37 Dorling Drive, Ewell, Surrey KT17 3BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00423/FLH, dated 30 March 2022, 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 approved plans 201 and 202.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the materials to be used on the external elevations of the proposal hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above is taken from the planning application form, as that is what the Appellant sought consent for. I have retained it in my formal decision as it provides a general overall description of the development. However, this does not refer to some of the detail as shown on the submitted plans as considered by the Council, such as the 2 storey front extension would also extend at first floor level to the side of the dwelling. That is clearly shown on the plans and I have considered the appeal on the basis of what is shown on the submitted plans.
3. I was provided with additional information by the appellant of further planning permissions which have been granted in the surrounding area, including at 39 Dorling Drive which is immediately adjacent to the appeal site. Comments were

sought from the Council on this matter, although none were received. Given the proximity to the appeal site, I have taken this information into account in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property with particular regard to the principal elevation, and on the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and appearance of the host property

5. The host property is a substantial detached property located in a spacious plot and set back from the public highway. The surrounding properties are of a similar scale, in equivalent sized plots. The front elevations of the properties in the street are not set a consistent distance from edge of the pavement.
6. The appeal proposal involves substantial extensions to three elevations of the host property which would significantly increase the overall size of the dwelling. I note the advice contained within the Householder Applications: Supplementary Planning Guidance dated January 2004 (SPG) which seeks to ensure extensions are subordinate. However, the enlarged dwelling would not appear incongruous in the context of the substantial plot in which the dwelling is sited and its position set back from the public highway. The front elevation would broadly align with the neighbouring properties as they were at the time of my site visit due to the staggering in the positions of the front elevations. Given the scale and extent of the proposed extensions, they would not appear as dominant or incongruous extensions to the host property, but as an integral part of an extended dwelling. I therefore consider that the appeal proposal would not appear as an over-dominant alteration to the existing dwelling.
7. Concern has been raised by residents as to the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the wider surrounding area, although this is not an issue raised by the Council in their reason for refusal, which focuses on the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. My attention has been drawn to the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Environmental Character Study (ECS). The site falls within Area 29 where Dorling Drive is identified as a prominent street and the ECS identifies the overall levels of uniformity in the surrounding area as important. Dorling Drive has an overall cohesive appearance due to the similarities in the use of materials and linking of design features along the street as a whole. The appeal proposal indicates the materials would be similar to those in the surrounding area and would reflect the distinctive fenestration. There are other examples of projecting two storey gables elsewhere along Dorling Drive. I therefore consider the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
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 host property and the surrounding area in accordance with the LDF Core Strategy adopted 2007 Policies CS 1 and CS 5 which seek high quality development, and Development Management Policies Document adopted September 2015 Policies

DM9 and DM10 which require development to incorporate the principles of good design.

Other Matters

9. Concern has been raised by a neighbouring resident as to the effect of the development on their living conditions. This is not cited as a reason for refusal by the Council, and their officer report is clear that the effect of the appeal proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would be acceptable. From what I observed on site, given the relationship between the appeal site and its neighbours, I have no reason to disagree with this. Concern has also been raised regarding the noise and disturbance that would be associated with the development being carried out, however this would be short term and limited due to the nature of the appeal proposal and no additional controls would be necessary.
10. The windows on the side elevations are shown as obscure glazed on the plans. It has been suggested by neighbouring residents that the windows shown on the side elevations of the property should be obscure glazed and non-opening. The Council have referred to these windows being obscure glazed in their report as contributing to the acceptability of the works but have not requested that such a condition be imposed should the appeal be allowed. Given that one of the windows is at ground floor level in the narrow area between the side elevations of the two properties, and the first-floor window is serving a bathroom, I consider that it would not be necessary to impose such a condition, having had regard to the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework that conditions should only be imposed where necessary.

Conditions

11. The Council have not suggested any conditions be imposed on the appeal. However, it is necessary to impose the standard conditions relating to commencement and approved plans to define the terms of the permission.
12. The use of appropriate materials will be necessary to ensure the appeal proposal has an acceptable visual impact. While details of materials are provided on the application form, they are not sufficiently detailed to allow a compliance condition to be imposed. A condition requiring the details to be approved by the Council is therefore considered to be reasonable.

Conclusion

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

J Downs

INSPECTOR