



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2023

by Robert Naylor BSc (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/23/3322403

18 Mount Pleasant, Ewell, Epsom KT17 1XE

- 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 Dan Jennison against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
- The application Ref 23/00026/FLH, dated 21 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2023.
- The development proposed is the alterations and extension of main roof (involving conversion of loft space to habitable use) incorporating dormer window and two rooflights on front roofslope.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the alterations and extension of main roof (involving conversion of loft space to habitable use) incorporating dormer window and two rooflights on front roofslope at 18 Mount Pleasant, Ewell, Epsom KT17 1XE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00026/FLH, dated 21 December 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 following approved plans: 18MP/02A, 18MP/03A, 18MP/04A, 18MP/05A, 18MP/06A and 18MP/07A
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extensions hereby approved shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development cited in the planning application form differs to that contained within the decision notice and appeal form. There is no evidence that this change was formally agreed. The latter more accurately reflects the scope of the proposed plans which were submitted, consulted upon, determined by the Council and are now the subject of this appeal. As no parties' interests would be prejudiced, in the interests of clarity I rely upon that latter description for the purposes of the heading above and paragraph 1 of my Decision.
3. There is another appeal at the adjoining property at 20 Mount Pleasant made by a separate appellant also against the refusal of planning permission by Epsom and Ewell Council. This appeal is for the *"alterations of existing bungalow involving raising of existing main ridge height pitched roof to create habitable first floor incorporating alterations to fenestration"* and is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is located on the northern side of Mount Pleasant, a residential cul-de-sac consisting of detached and semi-detached bungalows and two-storey dwellinghouses. The entrance to Mount Pleasant consists mainly of the bungalow properties, albeit some of these have been extended to provide living accommodation in the roof space. Within the area, there are purpose built two-storey detached properties, adding to the variety in appearance of buildings. The character and appearance are therefore varied in terms of the design, material and styles of the properties, however despite this variation the overall appearance of the street scene provides an increase in height and scale, as one moves from the lower level bungalows at the beginning of the road, to the taller two-storey dwellings at the end of the cul-de-sac.
6. The appeal site is located within the cluster of smaller bungalows which all exhibit either hipped or gables roof slopes to the front elevations. This cluster occupies a prominent and important position, close to the start of the road, which emphasises the overall low building level and low-density character of this part of the area.
7. The proposal would provide alterations to the roof shape, by rotating the ridge 90 degrees to allow for a large flat roof extension to the rear with mansard cheeks and a modest front dormer window. Whilst the proposal would create significant visual bulk at the roof level, this would be positioned to the rear of the site limiting public views, with only minor alterations to the ridge height. Whilst providing additional accommodation in the roof space, the height, scale and visual impact of the proposal from the street scene would still resemble the lower level buildings either side of the appeal scheme. Consequently, the proposal would be akin to the architectural form of the cluster of bungalows in this part of the road.
8. The provision of the front dormer is a modest addition to the front roof slope and would be representative of a similar development at No 7. The Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Householder Applications Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), adopted January 2004, highlights that dormers should not normally be introduced to the front or side elevations in order to maintain street character. However, whilst material to my considerations, the SPG is not mandatory and designed to be interpreted flexibly, as individual site circumstances can vary.
9. Furthermore, from my site observations there is a prevalence of other bungalow properties that have extended into the roof slope at the rear, which are visible from public vantage points, most notably at Nos. 3, 5, 7, 12, 19 and 26. Whilst these properties have created additional accommodation in the roof space, these additions are proportional to the main dwelling and still read as bungalows as they maintain the low building level and low-density character in this part of the area. Given this treatment, the appeal proposal has been sympathetically designed with a lower roof form to minimise its impact and

would appear similar to others in the area. As a result, the appeal proposal would not seem jarring, appearing as a coherent built form in the vicinity.

10. Overall, I would conclude that the retention of the height and scale of the existing form of the property, when considering the extensions would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would accord with the relevant provisions of Policy CS5 of the Epsom and Ewell Core Strategy 2007, Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Epsom and Ewell Development Management Policies, adopted September 2015 and the aims and objectives of the Householder Applications SPG which amongst other things, seeks to provide high quality design, which reinforces local distinctiveness and respects and maintains scale, layout, height, form (including roof form) and massing. The proposal would also accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which amongst other things, also seeks to secure high quality design which protects local character.

Conditions

11. I have imposed conditions requiring commencement of development within three years, and development to be in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. I have also attached a condition requiring the use of matching materials in the interests of a good quality appearance to the development. I have considered these in relation to the tests within paragraph 56 of the Framework and find that they are necessary in this case.
12. I have not attached the Council's suggested condition in respect to obscured glazing on the side facing dormer on the north eastern elevation, as the plans before me do not indicate that there are any windows in either flank elevation. As such it is unnecessary to include such a condition.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Robert Naylor

INSPECTOR