



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2025

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/24/3354283

53 Beaconsfield Road, Epsom, Surrey, KT18 6HY.

- 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 Manita Panesar against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00659/FLH.
 - The development proposed is front porch roof, ground floor rear extension, loft hip to gable with main dormer, raised ridge line, internal alterations and all associated works at 53 Beaconsfield Rd.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 53 Beaconsfield (No 53) is a detached bungalow, located in the built-up residential area of Epsom. The area is characterised by an eclectic mix of single and two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings, a number of which have previously been extended.
4. The appellant proposes the replacement of the two existing conservatory style rear additions with a full width single storey rear extension. The proposed flat roof of which would be appreciably higher than the established eaves line of the property. Also proposed are alterations to the roof, including raising the ridge height, the replacement of the hipped roof with a gable ended structure, insertion of 4 roof lights in front roof slope and the construction of a virtually full width flat roof box dormer to the rear roof slope.
5. The existing property is an attractive and well proportioned vernacular styled bungalow. There are examples of hip to gable end roof enlargements nearby. However, the alterations here when considered in the context of the proposed large rear box dormer, the height of the rear addition and its visual relationship to the dormer would, when taken together, result overall in an unattractive, utilitarian, bulky and incongruous addition to the roof of the host property.

6. For the foregoing reasons I conclude in respect of the main issue that the development as designed would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and the character and appearance of the wider area.
7. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CS5 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007 (Adopted 2007) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council's Development Management Policies Document (Adopted September 2015) and Part 4 of the Householder Applications Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted 28 January 2004), as they relate to, amongst other things, the requirement that all development should be of high quality inclusive design that reinforces local distinctiveness and complements the attractive characteristics of the Borough.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of similar developments in the area, including that to the neighbouring buildings on either side of No 53. I also appreciate that the property as enlarged could be considered to make more efficient use of the land and possibly aid multi-generational living. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified in this case.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR