



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/24/3355372

24 The Parade, Epsom, Surrey, KT18 5DH.

- 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 Lee against the decision of Epsom and Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00975/FLH.
 - The development proposed is described as *removal of soft landscaping to the front of the house and replacing with block paved area for off street parking. Replacement of existing windows with new to match existing.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of soft landscaping to the front of the house and replacing with block paved area for off street parking. Replacement of existing windows with new to match existing at 24 The Parade, Epsom, Surrey, KT18 5DH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00975/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) No development shall commence until details of the proposed hard and soft landscaping, including samples of the proposed paving materials, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 2024-07-24-001 and 002.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be whether the development would serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Church Street Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, 24 The Parade comprises a two-storey semi-detached property. It is sited adjacent to a turning head at the end of The Parade, a no through road, from which vehicular access is currently taken to No 24.

4. The dwelling currently has off road parking. However, as I observed there is very limited on-street parking for visitors, tradesmen, deliveries etc adjacent to the property. The property is located in the Church Street Conservation Area.
5. The Council has identified no harm in respect of the proposed alterations to the fenestration. From what I have seen and read I have not formed a contrary view.
6. It is proposed to re-surface the front garden with block paving. The existing low boundary wall, hedge and pedestrian gate to the front garden, opposite and giving access to the front door would be retained. Due to the height of the existing hedge the loss of the planted front garden, which in any case is mainly laid to lawn would have limited visual impact on either the setting of the house itself or the wider street scene.
7. Furthermore, from the appellant's evidence I note that she would be prepared to introduce some additional planting. This is a matter that if I were minded to allow the appeal could be conditioned.
8. On balance I consider that the loss of the front garden would not enhance the appearance of the property, but it would not harm it. I have therefore concluded on the main issue that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. It would therefore accord with the objectives of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2007 (Adopted 2007) and Policies DM5, DM8, DM9 and DM10 of the Epsom and Ewell Borough Council Development Management Policies Document (Adopted September 2015) and Part 13 of the Householder Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted 28 January 2004) as they relate, along with other things to the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Conditions

9. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in light of the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of precision and enforceability, I have amended the Council's suggested wording where appropriate.
10. I shall condition both hard and soft landscaping, and in the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR