

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/23/3335609

16 Walsingham Gardens, Stoneleigh, Surrey KT19 0LU

- 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 Plamen Strehin against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. 23/00997/FLH, dated 14 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is for an extended front porch, two storey side extension, part two storey part single storey rear extension and miscellaneous internal and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2023, but there are no material changes relevant to the substance of the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 14 Walsingham Gardens, with respect to light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling comprises a hipped roofed semi-detached house located within a residential street where many houses have been altered and extended over time. There is also a noticeable slope upwards the further north one travels along Walsingham Gardens such that 18 Walsingham Gardens is on higher ground than the appeal site.
5. The appeal proposals in pure aesthetic terms would constitute a multitude of elements and roof forms rendering it very jumbled in its appearance and failing to appear as a cohesive whole. Views from the public realm would constitute an extended ridge line truncated by a quasi half gable, below which would be a mansard roof running down to the northern boundary of the site. When compared to the subservient forms found on no18, the scheme before me would constitute a

number of complicated and contrasting roof designs which combined with a lack of set-back to the common side boundary and a lack of set-back from the front elevation of the existing dwelling would visually dominate it and detract from its character and cohesiveness, the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part, and the wider street scene.

6. Therefore, whilst the appeal proposal would avoid a projection towards the street at first floor level, that would not be the case at ground floor level. I understand that the purpose of a set-back is to lessen a terracing effect in a street and that in this case the topography of the site and surrounding land would avoid such a situation occurring, nonetheless it would erode the current spaciousness that exists between the host dwelling and the northern boundary.
7. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies CS5 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Core Strategy 2007 and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Development Management Policies Document September 2015 which together require high quality design for all developments, requiring proposals to make a positive contribution to the Borough's visual character and appearance whilst having regard to the prevailing development typology, including housing types and sizes with the scale, layout, height, form (including roof forms), massing and typical details and key features being respected, maintained or enhanced whilst having regard to the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004.

Living Conditions

8. No16 and its adjoining neighbour at no14 have two storey bay windows on their rear elevations serving habitable rooms, with the latter being on lower ground, albeit with a decking area slightly higher than the patio area of the host dwelling. The Council's Householder Applications Design Guidance states that single storey extensions onto semi-detached single storey properties should be no more than 3.25m deep, in order to protect the outlook from and daylight into the adjoining property. I consider that it is reasonable to use this as a guide when assessing single storey rear extensions onto two storey semi-detached properties because as would be the case for a bungalow, habitable rooms are also present on the ground floor.
9. At 5.2m deep the single storey element would provide a substantial addition in close proximity to the shared boundary and whilst I acknowledge that a fair proportion of this would have a flat roof, nonetheless it would be relatively high still. Consequently, I consider that it would give rise to a material loss of outlook from, and daylight to, the rear habitable room window of no14, again contrary to the aforementioned Policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document which sets out design requirements for new developments, including house extensions, and requires proposals to also have regard to the amenities of occupants and neighbours, including in terms of outlook and daylight.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR