



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P3610/D/25/3368789

15 Beech Road, Epsom, Surrey, KT17 4NH

- 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 Christopher Keri-Nagy against the decision of Epsom & Ewell Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00302/FLH.
 - The development proposed is the creation of a front dormer incorporating 2 x windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the creation of a front dormer incorporating 2 x windows at 15 Beech Road, Epsom, Surrey, KT17 4NH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00302/FLH, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: plans numbered 501 and 502 dated Oct 2024.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. The development has commenced, and the appeal is therefore in relation to obtaining permission retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, end of terrace dwelling. It is located in a part of Beech Road which is relatively mixed in character and appearance, comprising terraced, detached and semi-detached dwellings.
5. There are several examples of front dormer windows close to the appeal property including on the adjacent dwelling, 13a Beech Road and opposite the site at nos. 6, 8 and 10 Beech Road, amongst others. The Council confirm that most of these were either constructed as original features of the dwellings or that they predate their Householder Applications: Supplementary Planning Guidance 2004 (the SPG)

which advises that dormers should not normally be introduced on front elevations. Notwithstanding this, front dormers do form part of the established character and appearance of the area.

6. The dormer that has been constructed has a width of 1.5m and a height of 1.3m. It has been constructed above the front gable of the dwelling and is set in from the sides and is positioned well above the eaves and down from the ridge of the dwelling. It is therefore a subservient feature of the roof.
7. The dormer is slightly offset from the apex of the dormer and the first floor window below. However, this is not particularly noticeable at street level and the dormer does not significantly detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling in this regard. Moreover, given the immediate context of the appeal property where front dormers are widespread, the dormer that has been constructed does not stand out as a particularly prominent or incongruous feature within the street scene.
8. The appeal property is at the end of the terrace. The remainder of the terrace is staggered in height reflecting the fall in levels along the road towards the south-west. I acknowledge that no other dwellings within the same terrace as the appeal property have been extended by way of a front dormer. However, owing to the position of the dormer on a dwelling at the end of the terrace, I find that the dormer does not significantly interrupt or detract from the simplicity of the sloping, staggered roof form of the remainder of the terrace.
9. I acknowledge that the development is be contrary to the guidance on front dormers within the Council's SPG. However, whilst useful, the guidance should not be applied rigidly when the circumstances of the site indicate that other considerations are important. Indeed, this was acknowledged by the Council in their decision to allow the front dormer at 6 Beech Road in 2023.
10. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the development has not resulted in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find that it complies with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document (2015) which collectively promote high-quality design, the enhancement of the townscape and respect for the street scene. The proposal would also comply with the design objectives set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

Conditions

11. The standard implementation condition is unnecessary as the development has begun. The approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR