



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2024

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/24/3336909

1 The Headway, Ewell, Surrey KT17 1UJ

- 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 Will Stanley against the decision of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01272/FLH, dated 23 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a covered timber porch, removal of existing render to expose existing brickwork and install mock Tudor cladding with render in between.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In addition to this proposal, I was also the Inspector for an appeal relating to other proposed developments (a carport, outbuilding and wall, railings, and gate) at the same property which is the subject of a separate decision - APP/P3610/D/24/3336907.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the Ewell Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located at the end of The Headway, a private road of predominately 1930s detached properties. No.1 has been extended to the side and has an extensive width, nonetheless, space remains to each side of the property. Positioned at the end of the road the property is also visible from Spring Street and the car park to Bourne Hall opposite
5. The Headway forms part of the Ewell Village Conservation Area (EVCA) covering an extensive area which includes the commercial village centre and residential areas with notable natural features including springs, woodland and green space together with buildings of merit. The spacious, detached properties and landscape qualities of The Headway are referenced in the EVCA Character Appraisal and Management Proposals document, and the architectural character of the properties and the pattern of development contribute to the character and appearance of the area.

6. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.
7. I agree with the Council that the appeal property makes a neutral contribution to the EVCA and has undergone various alterations. From what I observed, timber is a material which features on many of the properties along The Headway, particularly in the first-floor gable projections. The existing cream render and extensive tile hanging of No.1 has a somewhat different appearance to the other properties along The Headway, and the use of mock Tudor and exposing brickwork would reinstate some of the property's original character.
8. However, in contrast to the other properties, which primarily exhibit timber and render to the upper floor, the proposed design would consume the whole property. The extensive use of mock Tudor cladding would be out of keeping and the continuation over the large side element, which was not part of the original property, would add to the visual discordance.
9. Porches are not a prolific feature of properties along The Headway and where they do occur, they are generally part of the original form created from a projecting first floor or they are of a modest canopy style. The appeal property has an existing single-storey flat-roofed element across the frontage of the original property and compared to other properties it has a limited setback from the road. Whilst the proposed porch would be of a canopy form with a tiled roof and timber supports it is a wide structure and part of the roof would project in front of the property's two-storey gable feature. As such, the porch would appear as a disproportionate and incongruous feature to the detriment of the character of the host property.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant is investing in the property, that the proposed features are found along The Headway and that planning permission has been granted for a porch to nearby properties. Be that as it may, each proposal is to be considered on its own merits and it is the scale and extent of the proposed elements which would be harmful. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would fail to harmonise with the prevailing character and ensure that the appearance of the EVCA is preserved.
11. The impact of the development would be localised and the effect on the Conservation Area as a whole would be less than substantial. Nonetheless, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) great weight is to be given to the conservation of heritage assets irrespective of the level of harm and there are no identified public benefits which would outweigh this harm.
12. Thus, the proposal would therefore conflict with policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy 2007 and policies DM8, DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015. Together these seek to protect the built and natural environment, to conserve and enhance heritage assets and reinforce local distinctiveness. Additionally, they promote good design and require extensions and alterations to respect the prevailing development, the scale, form and massing, typical details and to maintain key features.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR