

Monthly Report on Planning Appeal Decisions

Report by: Martin Holley, Planning Development Manager/Ruth Ormella, Head of Planning

The planning department has received the following 5 appeal decisions from the 21st January 2019 to 25th February 2019.

Site Address	Planning Reference Numbers	Description of Development	Decision + Costs?
5 Poplar Farm Close, West Ewell, Surrey	18/00181/TPO APP/TPO/P3610/6910	Felling of Lombardy Poplar located in the front garden of 5 Poplar Farm Close adjacent to Ronena Chessington Close (T8 of TPO 308).	Allowed 21 st January 2019 No costs to either side
9 Ernest Cottages, Kingston Road, Ewell KT17 2DS	18/00033/FLH APP/P3610/W/18/3206483	Replacement of 4 single-glazed, wooden sash windows at the front with 4 double-glazed, wood-effect uPVC sash windows.	Allowed 11 th February 2019 No costs to either side
2 Pine Hill, Epsom KT18 7BG	18/00052/OUT APP/P3610/W/18/3208832	Outline application (All matters reserved) for alteration and extension to building to facilitate change of use from 10 bedroom HMO property (Sui Generis) to 8 flats (Class C3).	Dismissed 11 th February 2019 No costs to either side
The land at 415 Kingston Road, Ewell KT19 0BT	Appeal against three Enforcement Notices APP/P3610/C/18/3194904 APP/P3610/C/18/3194905 APP/P3610/C/18/3194906	N/A	Dismissed 11 th February 2019 Minor amendments to one of the enforcement notices is required

<p>Land adjacent to the Kings Arms Public House, 144 East Street, Epsom KT17 1EY</p>	<p>17/01209/FUL APP/P3610/W/18/3205106</p>	<p>Erection of a three-storey building on land adjacent to public house building to provide 8 self-contained flats (3x1bed, 3x2 bed 2x3 bed) and associated hard and soft landscaping, car and cycle parking and refuse store and the demolition of a single storey annexe extension to Kings Arms Public House (as amended)</p>	<p>Dismissed 19th February 2019</p> <p>No costs to either side</p>
--	--	--	--

Summary of Appeal Decisions:

5 Poplar Farm Close, West Ewell:

The Inspector allowed the felling of the Lombardy poplar as she was not satisfied that the tree will grow no further roots and stem girth and that the options for short term repairs and resurfacing work are limited and would not address the distortion of ground levels to a satisfactory level. She held the view that the overall effect on the character and appearance of the area would be minor.

9 Ernest Cottages, Kingston Road, Ewell:

This appeal came about through the non-determination of the application within the normal 8 week period. The officer's assessment of the application was to grant permission subject to conditions. As the appeal was made the jurisdiction for the decision rested with the Planning Inspectorate and as such the Inspector assessed the proposal and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The Inspector agreed with the Council's officer assessment and as such allowed the appeal.

2 Pine Hill, Epsom:

The Inspector held the view the plans did not clearly indicate that the building would need to be much larger to provide the 8 flats with their 18 bedrooms. The Inspector acknowledged that the site is a large corner plot however the submitted plans do not at all demonstrate how a building of this scale could be designed to respect local distinctiveness in an area characterised by finely proportioned buildings. The Inspector concluded that based on the submitted information the proposal would unacceptably harm living conditions at the next door house.

Land at 415 Kingston Road, Ewell:

The appeal relates to three flats which are unlawful, and the Inspector having regard for the evidence before him upheld the notices. The details of these appeals are set out in the Inspectors Report.

Land adjacent to Kings Arms Public House, 144 East Street, Epsom:

The Inspector agreed with the Council to set aside one of the reasons for refusal relating to affordable housing as the Council's Local Plan predates the NPPF and would not be a major for which affordable housing would be required. The Inspector dismissed the appeal and provided a full Report addressing the character and appearance, impacts to existing and future occupiers and development on the adjoining land. In concluding the Inspector held the view that the benefits of the development did not outweigh the harm.