



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/24/3341121

141 Riverview Road, Ewell, Surrey, KT19 0JQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Tasneem Randeree against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01397/FLH.
 - The development proposed is remodel of detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The appeal proposal is described on the Council's decision notice as: *two storey front extension, two-storey side extension and single storey rear extension. Alteration of roof including rear dormer extension and raising of roof ridge (incorporating conversion of loft space to habitable use)*. I consider that this is a fuller and more accurate description of the proposal than that on the application form set out above and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main issues

3. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

4. 141 Riverview Road is a two storey detached house in an established residential area where the prevailing architectural character is of 'Metroland' Arts and Crafts inspired design. The majority of houses along this part of the street are two storey semi-detached houses with a number of two storey terraced houses further along to the southwest and No. 141 is therefore unusual in being detached. It has previously been extended with a two storey rear extension and there is a single storey covered storage area along the north flank wall and a detached outbuilding used as living space at the end of the rear garden.
5. The relevant policies in this case include CS5 of the Core Strategy 2007 (the Core Strategy) and DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015 (the DMPD) which require high quality design for all development and, among other things, seek to reinforce local distinctiveness

and respect the prevailing development typology, including house types and sizes, scale, height, form and massing and detailing such as roof forms, window format and design detailing of elevations. Proposals should also have regard to the amenities of occupants and neighbours in terms of matters including outlook and light.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance *Householder Applications* 2004 (the SPG) contains specific advice for proposals for house extensions, including dormer windows. Among other things, two storey side extensions should not project towards the street in front of the main house walls, but should be set back from the existing front wall and away from the side boundary. Full height windows at first floor level in new front and rear elevations should be avoided to ensure neighbours' privacy.

Character and appearance

7. The proposal is an amended version of an earlier scheme which was refused planning permission in 2022. It consists of a number of elements, including a two storey front infill extension and the replacement of the full height front bow windows to create a new front entrance within a full height front extension. A new two storey side extension would replace the existing single storey storage area and run the full length of the side elevation to join with the proposed single storey rear extension. The roof ridge height would be raised together with a rear dormer to allow for new habitable space in the roof.
8. I consider that the cumulative effect of the various elements would completely overwhelm the original character and appearance of the house. Although it has been altered from its original form and is a relatively simple unadorned example of the style prevalent in the area, it nevertheless retains a character and appearance which is in keeping with that style.
9. The proposed three front gables would appear mismatched with each other and out of keeping in the context of the design detailing of the gables over the bow windows characteristic of the area. This disparity would be exacerbated by the use of full glazing in the apex of the two main gables and the use of full height glazing at ground and first floor levels.
10. The proposed increase in overall height and the bringing forward of the front elevation, together with the width over two storeys would result in a form and mass which would appear excessive, top heavy and out of proportion with the original house itself and within the width of the site.
11. The proposed dormer would integrate with the existing crown roof section. It would therefore not be set down from the roof ridge and would effectively extend the existing crown roof, resulting in a top heavy appearance.
12. The proposal includes the rendering of the walls with a light grey finish and the use of upvc and aluminium windows and smooth flat grey tiles. The existing house is finished in white render and the use of light grey would not be typical. Similarly the use of aluminium windows and smooth grey roof tiles would be out of keeping with the prevailing character of the area.
13. Overall, I consider that the design of the proposal, particularly the remodelling of the front elevation, the lack of setback of the side extension from the original front elevation, the sharp angles of the proposed full height forward projection and the large areas of full height glazing, together with design of the

fenestration and use of flat grey roof tiles, would not respect the local character and prevailing house types.

14. I have taken account of the examples of extensions to properties in the area and find that they vary in circumstances, siting and design. The proposed increase in height would not, in itself appear excessive, but the detailed design of the gables and fenestration would make it appear unduly prominent and out of proportion with the existing house and out of character with the house types in the immediate vicinity.
15. Many of the nearby properties have side extensions at ground floor level and several have two storey extensions. Notwithstanding this, the street scene has a spacious feel to it due to the separation which is maintained between buildings at first floor and roof level. The cumulative effect of the proposed extensions and increase in roof height would appear excessive in bulk and mass and would diminish the spacious appearance of the street scene.
16. I conclude that the proposal, by virtue of its design, height, overall size, architectural detailing and materials would harm the character and appearance of the house itself and the street scene, contrary to policies DM9 and DM10 of the DMPD and policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and the SPG.

Living conditions

17. The proposed two storey side extension would be set away from the side boundary with the neighbouring property, 139 Riverview Road, by 0.9m. I consider that there would be some impact on the outlook from No. 139 but that this would be limited since it would not project further towards the rear than the existing two storey rear extension which already projects beyond the rear building line of No. 139. The main part of the latter house is separated from the boundary by a full depth single storey side extension and the principal rear facing windows are therefore set at some distance from the proposed extension to No. 141.
18. I conclude that the proposal would not result in an increase in the level of dominance and loss of light to No. 139, and that in this respect, it is consistent with policies DM9 and DM10 of the DMPD and policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and the SPG.
19. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR