Monthly Appeal and Housing Figure Reports

Ward	(All Wards)
Contact officer	Steven Lewis

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

The Planning Service has received the following Appeal decisions from 19th November 2020 to 18th December 2020.

Site	Planning reference	Description of	Decision
Address		development	and Costs
39A	20/00605/FLH	Erection of car	Dismissed
Alexandra		port, boundary	No Costs
Road	APP/P3610/D/20/3256573	fence and	
Epsom		entrance gates.	
KT17 4DA			
245 London	20/00524/FLH	Ground, first floor,	Dismissed
Road		and loft extensions	– No Costs
Ewell	APP/P3610/D/20/3256056		
Surrey			
KT17 2BU			
42	19/01532/FLH	1st floor side	Dismissed
Briarwood		extension with	– No Costs
Road	APP/P3610/D/20/3250445	single storey rear	
Stoneleigh		extension	
KT17 2LY		including loft	
		conversion with	
		new front and rear	
		roof dormers with	
		skylights to the	
		front roof slope	

Summary of Appeal Decisions:

39A Alexandra Road, Epsom

The main issues were the effects of the development (a car port, gates and fencing) on the street scene and the protected tree within the grounds of 39 Alexandra Road.

The car port has held to be prominent from the south-east where it is seen with the new gates and fencing in the foreground. Although of contemporary design and lightweight construction, the canopy was held to be incongruous due to its siting forward of the dwelling; this being at odds with the prevailing character of Alexandra

Planning Committee 14 January 2021

Road. The adverse impacts were held to be exacerbated by the visually harsh front boundary treatment and the lack of any vegetation along the frontage.

Individually and cumulatively, the gates, fencing and car port are materially harmful to the street scene of Alexandra Road.

The car port falls within the root protection area of a mature beech tree in the grounds of No 39. This large specimen has a tree preservation order (TPO) in recognition of its significant contribution to the amenity of the area.

In the absence of information about method of construction it was commented that it is impossible to draw any conclusions on the lasting effects on the tree. That development has already taken place was not adequate reason to ignore the issue, since it is conceivable that removal of the car port could limit any harm and allow the root system time to recover. Retention of the TPO tree was considered important to the street scene of Alexandra Road. The appellant's failure to properly demonstrate that permanent harm will not result from retention of the car port leads to conflict with Policy.

245 London Road, Ewell

The height, depth and position of the extension on the boundary was felt to combine to make it an oppressive feature which detrimentally increases the sense of enclosure in the neighbours' garden. These impacts were held to be much greater in comparison with the fallback of the permitted scheme with fencing or vegetation along the boundary and resulting in an unacceptable adverse impact.

42 Briarwood Road, Stoneleigh

The Inspector commented that the main issue was the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

In combination with the gable, the dormer was felt to result in a scale and bulk of extension that would appear an unduly prominent and incongruous addition to the host house and unbalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair and would upset the rhythm of development in the area.

The Inspector noted similar example of extension drawn to his attention in Waverley Road and Briarwood Road and that these pre-dated the development plan. As consequence of the harm identified and being contrary to the local plan, the appeal was dismissed.

Planning Committee 14 January 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	
Total		136		

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.