

Monthly Report Planning Appeal Decisions

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

Report by Steven Lewis, Planning Development Manager/Ruth Ormella, Head of Planning

The Planning Service has received the following Appeal decisions from 20th October 2019 to 2nd December 2019.

Site Address	Planning reference	Description of development	Decision and Costs
11 Thorndon Gardens, Epsom	APP/P3610/D/19/3233656 19/00076/FLH	Erection of detached front garden outbuilding (use as security box for motorbike storage).	Allowed No Cost Application
Rear of 44-48 Stoneleigh Broadway, Stoneleigh	APP/P3610/W/19/3229225 19/00178/REM	Variation of plans condition to allow a revised layout and design for the building approved in 2015	Dismissed No Cost Application
Stone Cottage, Woodcote Park, Epsom	APP/P3610/W/19/3226932 18/00545/FLH	Front porch extension, rear extension, first floor rear extension, loft rooms including new roof and dormer	Allowed No Cost Application

Summary of Appeal Decisions:

11 Thorndon Gardens

The Inspector found that given the design of the outbuilding and its discreet location it appeared compatible with development in the area which included extensions and garaging to the side of properties. Although smaller in scale than nearby development, the discreet location of the outbuilding ensured that it is not overly prominent in the street scene.

Planning Committee

19 December 2019

44-48 Stoneleigh Broadway

The Inspector dismissed the case as the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of 44-50 Stoneleigh Broadway due it providing direct overlooking towards the rear windows of the upper floor flats in an elevated position.

Furthermore a planning obligation to secure affordable housing was not provided by the applicant who had not demonstrated with certainty that the exceptions to affordable housing requirements, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework applied in this case.

11 The Hawthorns

The Inspector found that the existing dwelling does not have a symmetrical appearance to its front elevation, that the porch not introduce an unbalancing element that would unacceptably disturb the front elevation and would add variety to the design in the area.

In terms of the side extension it would remove an uncharacteristic flat roof element and the pitched roof design would have a more appropriate finish as it reflected the pitch forms of the existing semi-detached properties.

Dismissed the council's concerns that raising the roof would result in terracing and concluded that the gap would remain appreciable form the street.

Finally concluding that while he needed to depart form the Council's guidance to approve the application.

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
October	13	1	0
November	1	3	0
Total	261		

Annual target 695 dwellings

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