



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/25/3359588

7 Clandon Close, Stoneleigh KT17 2NQ

- 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 Mrs M Toomey against the decision of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01175/FLH
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the local area, and
 - The effect of the proposal on protected species.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling on the south-eastern side of Clandon Close and within a predominantly residential area. The property has been previously extended including with a side and rear extension. A hipped roof has been maintained at the property.
4. The proposal would seek to alter the existing hipped roof to a gable end and convert the loft space to residential accommodation with a flat roofed dormer across the extended roof slope to the rear and roof lights at the front.
5. The gable end would widen the house at roof level and the extended roof with its gable end would detract from the scale, proportions and appearance of the existing property. Although it would be set in from the roof edges, the rear dormer across the extended roof form would be a very large and dominant element that would result in the property appearing top heavy. The resultant roof form with the gable end and wide dormer addition would overwhelm the scale and proportions of the property.

6. Although not completely symmetrical as existing, the proposal to extend from a hip to a gable end would unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair and would detract from the street scene. With a small number of exceptions and although many of the properties have been extended and altered, hipped roofs remain the dominant roof form in the immediate vicinity. The proposal to change from a hip to a gable end would be visually intrusive in the street scene and harm the character and appearance of the local area. Although at the rear, the proposed dormer would be clearly seen from within the adjoining road, Calverley Road and would appear a discordant addition and out of proportion with surrounding properties and would detract from the character and appearance of the local area.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the of the local area. This would conflict with Policy CS5 of the Council's Core Strategy 2007 (Core Strategy), Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Council's Development Management Policies Document 2015 (DMP Document) and Part 4 of the Householder Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 together with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), with particular regard to Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
8. The Appellant has drawn my attention to other rear dormers in the vicinity of the site, a number of which I also saw on my site visit. Each proposal must be considered on its individual merits but in so far as the information has been made available, I have taken these other dormers into account. However, and whilst dormers are part of the street scene, none of them is comparable with the proposal before me, combining a hip to gable extended roof and rear dormer across the extended roof form. They do not therefore persuade me to different view.
9. Reference has been made by the Appellant to the future intentions of the immediate neighbours to undertake extension works at roof level, but my decision is necessarily based on the situation as it exists at the time of my determination of this appeal. The Appellant has referred to an alternative solution which she considers to be permitted development, but there is no information before me to confirm this position. Furthermore, it would be materially different to the proposal before me, and it does not therefore override the harm I have concluded in respect of this particular proposal the subject of this appeal.

Protected Species

10. There appears to be no disagreement between the Appellant and the Council that, as a result of the preliminary ecological assessment identifying the building as having a low potential for bats, a Phase II bat survey would be required. However, at the time of my decision, and reflecting the time of year, this has not been undertaken. The assessments require to be undertaken prior to the grant of planning permission and the imposition of a condition with a requirement for surveys to investigate the impact of a proposal on protected species is not, therefore, an appropriate way forward.
11. In the absence of the completion of the required surveys, and any recommendations arising including in respect of any mitigation, I cannot be satisfied that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on protected species which may be occupying the site. This would conflict with Policies CS1 and CS3 of the Core Strategy, Policy DM4 of the DMP Document, Section 15 of the

Framework, all of which amongst other matters require the conservation and enhancement of on-site biodiversity.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR