

## Appeal decision

Site: 34 Edenfield Gardens, Worcester Park, Surrey, KT4 7DU

Proposal: Proposed hip-to-gable roof extension and addition of full width rear dormer

Decision: Appeal allowed & planning permission granted

## EEBC grounds for refusal:

1. The proposed hip-to-gable loft conversion and rear dormer, due to its incongruous bulky form and foreign materials, would adversely impact the visual amenities of the street scene and therefore fails to comply with Policy DM9 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015.
2. The proposed rear dormer, due to its excessive bulk and massing and the full width/full height glazing across the rear, would severely impact the amenities of neighbouring properties, specifically through an overbearing impact and unacceptable loss of privacy. The proposal is therefore found to fail to comply with the requirements of Policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015.

## Appeal decision:

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft extension including dormer to rear at 34 Edenfield Gardens, Worcester Park, Surrey, KT4 7DU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00156/FLH, dated 1 May 2017, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

## Summary of appeal decision:

The Inspector stated that visual impact to the public realm would be limited with the development having most impact at the rear of the property. However, it was noted that, as the applicant property has already been substantially altered and extended, the work would not have a dramatic effect on the character of the dwelling. The conclusion on this point was "that whilst the proposed scheme would cause some harm to what remains of the original character and appearance of the host property at the rear, it would have a very limited and not unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and wider area."

With regard to loss of neighbouring amenities, the Inspector found that the existing situation of "mutual overlooking" would not be substantially altered, and that there was unlikely to be any sense of overbearing as a result of the proposed dormer. This section was closed with a statement of "no conflict with those provisions of DMPD policy DM10".

Conclusion of appeal decision:

The Inspector agreed with the Council that there would be some detrimental impact to the character and appearance of the original dwelling but found this was not sufficient to outweigh the points outlined above, and therefore concluded in favour of the appellants.

Conditions attached:

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: The OS location plan and Drawing Nos. 34/ED/010; 34ED/011; 34ED/012; 34ED/020; 34ED/021; 34ED/022; 34ED023; 34ED/111; 34ED/112; 34ED/120; 34ED/121; 34ED/122 & 34ED/123. All the approved drawings are marked as Rev P1, dated April 2017.
3. Unless otherwise specified in the original planning application form and approved drawings, the external materials utilised shall match those of the existing building.

N.B.: The Case Officer submitted an initial 'on balance' recommendation of approval to the Head of Planning. The favourable report closely shared the views of the Inspector. On review this was overturned and the report rewritten to account for the above reasons for refusal.