



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: 11 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/24/3341526

116 Riverview Road, Ewell, Surrey, KT19 0JP

- 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 Mr Nuno Afonso against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01424/FLH.
 - The development proposed is Loft conversion to detached bungalow with the demolishing of rear day room to replaced with a new extension across the rear of building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of hip to gable roof extension, rear roof extension involving conversion of loft space to habitable use incorporating rooflights and single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing single storey conservatory) at 116 Riverview Road, Ewell, Surrey, KT19 0JP, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/01424/FLH and the plans submitted with it, 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: location plan, ITE-201040-NA-001, ITE-201040-NA-002, ITE-201040-NA-003, ITE-201040-NA-004 and ITE-201040-NA-005.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. The appeal proposal is described on the Council's decision notice as: *Hip to gable roof extension, rear roof extension involving conversion of loft space to habitable use incorporating rooflights and single storey rear extension (following demolition of existing single storey conservatory)*. 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. 116 Riverview Road is a detached bungalow located in an established residential area. It is at the end of a row of bungalows on the north side of the street with the car park and access to a primary school to its west. The bungalows are broadly similar in style, with hipped and gabled tiled roofs and a variety of materials including render and brick. The properties on the opposite side of the street in this part of Riverview Road are a mix of bungalows and two storey houses.
5. The relevant policies in this case include CS1 and 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, promote a sustainable environment. They seek to reinforce local distinctiveness and require proposals to respect the prevailing development typology, including house types and sizes, scale, height, form and massing and detailing such as roof forms. 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 changes from hipped to gable roofs and the appropriate location of rooflights.
7. The proposal includes the alteration of the main roof to create a gable from the existing hipped roof to the west elevation of the building. I consider that, although this would be a radical alteration in the roof form, it would not necessarily be unacceptable in this context. The bungalow is at the end of a row, at an angle to the road, with a prominent garage partially obscuring the front of the building. The proposed gable would be angled away from the street and face the school car park and would not appear unduly prominent in the street scene.
8. Many of the neighbouring bungalows have been extended in various ways and there are numerous instances where garages have been constructed in front of the properties, often, as is the case of No. 116 itself, appearing as dominant features in the street scene. There are similar side facing gables in a small number of the nearby bungalows, but these are more towards the rear of the properties and relatively unobtrusive.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the bungalow itself, or the wider street scene 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.
10. The proposal includes rooflights to serve two of the upper floor bedrooms. Although they may appear less than the optimal size for the rooms, I consider that, although as bedrooms they are habitable rooms, they do not appear to be principal bedrooms and there would be ample light, ventilation and outlook elsewhere in the property. This would not be sufficient reason, on its own, to justify dismissing the appeal.

11. I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of future occupants and in this respect, it is consistent with DM9 and DM10 of the DMPD and policy CS5 of the Core Strategy.
12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

13. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR