

Monthly Report Planning Appeal Decisions

Ward:	(All Wards);
Contact Officer:	Steven Lewis

Report by Steven Lewis, Planning Development Manager

The Planning Service has received the following Appeal decisions from 20th August 2019 to 16th October 2019.

Site Address	Planning reference	Description of development	Decision and Costs
6 Links Road Epsom	APP/P3610/D/19/3235181 18/01437/FLH	One and half storey rear and side extension incorporating attic room above (re-submission of 18/01437/FLH).	Dismissed
6 Links Road Epsom	APP/P3610/W/19/3229660 19/0320/FLH	One and half storey rear and side extension incorporating a garage with attic room above (following demolition of existing side garage)	Dismissed
17 High Street, Epsom	APP/P3610/W/19/3232157 18/00944/FUL	Change of use of 2 nd floor and loft space at 3 rd floor level from retail (A1) usage to create a 3 bed flat, including external alterations.	Dismissed
11 The Hawthorns, Epsom	APP/P3610/W/19/3227263 18/01514/FUL	Erection of a two bedroom detached house.	Allowed No costs application
289 London Road, Ewell	APP/P3610/W/18/321522 18/00429/OUT	Construction of a terrace of 3 x 3 bedroom houses and access road following the demolition of two outbuildings	Allowed No costs application
346 Chessington Road, West Ewell	APP/P3610/W/19/3222948 17/01274/FUL	Erection of a detached dwelling on land to the rear	Allowed No costs application

Summary of Appeal Decisions:

6 Links Road

The Inspector found that form and materials proposed for the extensions in both appeals would not be complementary to the design and appearance of the original house.

In appeal for 19/00320/FLH, the angle of the mansard roof would held not reflect that on the house roof and the materials proposed would also contrast.

In appeal for 18/01437/FLH, the box like appearance of the upper floor and the use of cladding and render would not help the assimilation of the proposal to the host.

The extensions where held to be prominent, incongruous and discordant features in relation to the existing house and harm the character and appearance of the area.

17 High Street

The Inspector dismissed the case the proposal would not provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers in terms of private amenity space.

The Inspector employed the para 11 d exercise and gave additional weight to the sustainable location and additional housing. The moderate weight of the adverse impact was held in this case to significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits of the proposal.

11 The Hawthorns

The only issue of dispute between the parties was the proposed extent of private amenity space for the new property with the appellant stating that it would be 54.8sqm compared to the Council's measurements that it would be 26.1sqm

Despite the discrepancy between the parties the Inspector found that the area of rear garden would be similar to that for neighbouring properties and would fulfil the criteria included in Policy DM12 for private amenity space.

289 London Road

The proposal would replace existing outbuildings on the site, and whilst of a larger scale than the existing buildings, the built form of the appeal scheme was felt by the Inspector to be screened by the existing dwellings fronting London Road and Chadacre Road and their respective boundary treatments. As such they concluded that the new dwellings would not appear prominent as a result and in this particular context, would result in a modest redevelopment and not be harmful to the character of the area.

346 Chessington Road

The Council's reasons for refusal referred to the effect of the development on the maisonette dwelling Nos 344A and 344B. The main issues were the effect of the development on the occupants of adjacent occupants with particular reference to private amenity space and off-street car parking space.

Despite concluding that the private amenity space would not achieve the minimum 10 metre depth, in this case and owing to the shape and size of the site, they did not consider that it would be practical to achieve such a requirement and did not find any conflict with Policy DM12.

On the subject of parking the Inspector concluded that the proposal would not be unacceptably harmful to the safety of highway users in this location and there was no compelling evidence to indicate that an absence of on-site parking would lead to any significant car parking demand issues. As the proposal would not alter the existing car parking arrangements for neighbouring properties and the proposed dwelling would include one car parking space they concluded that the development would accord with Council's car parking standards.

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

Month	Committee	Delegated	Appeal
January	0	3	0
February	0	6	1
March	0	17	0
April	32	11	0
May	21	14	0
June	0	7	0
July	109	5	1
August	0	2	3
September	0	10	1
Total	243		

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.