

Monthly Report on Planning Appeals Decisions

Ward:	(All Wards);
Contact Officer:	Steven Lewis/Viv Evans

Report by Steven Lewis, Planning Development Manager/Viv Evans Head of Planning

The Planning Service has received the following Appeal decisions from 19th December 2020 to 20th January 2021.

Site Address	Planning reference	Description of development	Decision and Costs
24 Rowden Road West Ewell Surrey	19/01702/FLH APP/P3610/D/20/3250560	Hip to gable loft conversion including the installation of three roof windows into the pitched roof of the front elevation and the addition of a rear dormer.	Dismissed No Costs
259 Kingston Road Ewell Surrey	20/00109/FLH APP/P3610/D/20/3251369	Rebuilding part of the garage, ground floor rear extension, and side extension and loft conversion.	Dismissed No Costs
6 The Grove Epsom Surrey	20/00313/FUL APP/P3610/W/20/3256870	Erection of 7 x two bedrooms flats and 2 x three bedrooms flats and associated external works following demolition of the existing building	Dismissed No Costs
56 Sunnybank Epsom Surrey	20/00670/FLH APP/P3610/D/20/3257336	Erection of part single, part two storey side and rear wrap-around extension and single storey front porch extension	Dismissed No Costs

Planning Committee

18 February 2021

Summary of Appeal Decisions:

24 Rowden Road, West Ewell, Surrey

The Inspector identified that the design of this terrace is characterised by the steep hipped roofs to the houses either end of the terrace and to alter this in the manner proposed would seriously harm the appearance of the house, the symmetry of the terrace and would be of such significance to appear at odds in the street scene. Accordingly, the appeal was dismissed.

259 Kingston Road, Ewell, Surrey

The Inspector concluded that the proposal's hip to gable extension would be markedly at odds with the fairly consistent and locally distinctive roof form of the semi-detached properties along this stretch of the street scene. It would also unbalance this semi-detached pair. This extension was felt to significantly change this building's shape, and would create an awkward junction, which would relate poorly to the host's form and was harmful to the appearance of the area.

6 The Grove, Epsom, Surrey

The Council did not determine the application. It was indicated via the Planning Committee that, had it been in a position to do so, it would have refused permission for reasons relating to the quality of the living accommodation provided within the scheme and the impacts of the development on the conservation area and the amenities of neighbours and quantum of car parking.

The Inspector judged that the development would be prominent at the end of the cul-de-sac, its visibility increased by the removal of trees and vegetation on the western site boundary. The proposed layout provided no meaningful space for replacement planting to mitigate the adverse visual impacts of such a large and incongruous building. The overall building composition, with its multitude of dormers and complex roof forms, would be fussy and contrived. Its cumulative height and mass would have more in common with the adjoining blocks of flats – both negative components in the setting of the conservation area – than the domestic scale housing which characterises this part of the conservation area.

The underground parking is not a feature of The Grove, with other plots reliant on surface driveways. The ramp with its retaining walls on either side would be conspicuous at the front of the building. Its engineered appearance would make it an alien feature in the street scene. This would add to the harm arising from the excessive scale and poor design.

Accordingly, it was concluded that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Church Street Conservation Area. Significant weight is given to this harm.

The development was considered to have an excessive scale that would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the outlook of occupants of 7 The Grove.

Planning Committee 18 February 2021

The scheme was found to be satisfactory in terms of overall unit size and the provision of external amenity space. Nevertheless, the scheme conflicted with Policy DM12 in respect of bedroom sizes.

The Inspector found that there is no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the provision of one additional space over and above the minimum requirement would have an unacceptable impact on local on-street parking or traffic conditions. The lack of objection from the Highway Authority supported this view and no weight against the scheme from parking was placed.

Drawing the threads of issues together, the proposal was held to conflict with the development plan as a whole due to its impact on designated heritage assets and the living conditions of neighbouring residents, and the quality of living accommodation provided. Significant weight to the scale of the Council's housing shortfall and its Housing Delivery Action Plan but have nevertheless concluded that there are no material considerations which would justify a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

56 Sunnybank, Epsom, Surrey

The Inspector judged that many of the properties within Sunnybank are variations on a theme, with subtle changes in the architecture disguising a similar overall form. In this context, the proposal did not read as being out of character and although the Council raised concerns with the lack of sub ordinance and the design of the front roof extensions, these components were an acceptable appearance and did not consider them to be harmful to the host property or the street scene as a whole.

The submitted plans did not show the relationship of the proposed extension to No 54 and there was no evidence in the form of a daylight and sunlight study to inform a decision on whether the impact is likely to be within acceptable limits. In the absence of this information the Inspector concluded it was not possible to make a reliable judgement on the acceptability of the scheme and dismissed the appeal.

Planning Committee
18 February 2021

Net No. of dwellings for which planning permission has been granted

Month	Committee	Delegated	Appeal
April	0	2	1
May	55	2	0
June	0	3	0
July	14	7	0
August	0	18	0
September	0	1	0
October	0	14	0
November	8	11	0
December	98	14	
Total		248	

Annual target 695 dwellings

It should be noted that the above table and figures only count decisions which have been formally issued and also exclude decisions where there is an extant planning permission to avoid double counting.