



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/24/3336907

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 Stanley against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01271/FLH, dated 23 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of single storey car port alongside flank of existing property, erection of single-storey store/outbuilding and construction of new front boundary wall, railings & gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In addition to this proposal, I was also the Inspector for an appeal relating to a proposed porch and timber cladding at the same property which is the subject of a separate decision - APP/P3610/D/24/3336909.

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. Hedging forms the majority of the boundaries to the appeal property including the frontage to The Headway. Front boundaries to the other properties along the road vary, there are however a few properties, namely Nos. 5, 22 and 22a, which have walls, piers and railings similar in design to the proposal. These appear to have been recent additions and have more of an “estate” appearance compared to the predominant hedging and verges which give the road a verdant character. The proposed red brick wall and piers with interposing railings do not reflect the materials of the host property and the removal of the established hedge would significantly alter the relationship with the road. This would be particularly intrusive to the street scene given the extent of the front boundary and the property’s position at the entrance of The Headway.
8. From Spring Street, the property is enclosed by vegetation and there is a fenced substation to the corner. The outbuilding proposed to the east of the plot would be screened by the retained hedging and its slight forward siting, compared to the host property, would not be identifiable. Located within a Conservation Area the trees and hedging are protected, and the location is reflective of a previous consent for a garage. Moreover, the detached, single-storey outbuilding is not of an overly imposing scale, Nonetheless, together with the proposed carport, the space around the property would be notably diminished. Whilst an open structure, the carport would further lengthen the extensive property and are not a common feature in the area. Aligning with the gated driveway and with the removal of the hedging to the front it would be a noticeable feature at the entrance to The Headway.
9. Overall, I find that the development would be out of keeping and have an urbanising effect to the detriment of the character of the area and the significance of the Conservation Area. The effect on the EVCA would be less than substantial, and in accordance with Section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the harm is to be weighed against the public benefits. The appellant is investing in the property and there would be some economic benefits during the construction phase, however, the additions to the property would primarily be for the benefit of the appellant/occupiers. As set out in paragraph 205 of 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.
10. 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, plot widths, building lines, scale, form and massing, typical details and to maintain key features.

Other Matters

11. I appreciate the appellant’s desire to improve security and that they are seeking to enhance the property. However, this is not the only way this could

be achieved, and the lack of objections is a neutral matter and does not address the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

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

G Ellis

INSPECTOR