

PURLEY ON THAMES 12/02443 Pins Ref 2192369	The Lilacs Westbury Lane Purley On Thames Ms T Woodcock	Two number side extensions replacing existing pre-cast concrete garage and in place of derelict greenhouse	Delegated Refusal	Allowed 3.4.13
--	--	--	-------------------	----------------

The main issues considered in this appeal were:

- 1) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area
- 2) The effect on the living conditions of the neighbour at Glebe Cottage, in respect of outlook, light and privacy.

Discussion:

- 1) The Effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area

The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling which benefits from gardens to the front and rear of the property. The dwelling also benefits from a detached garage to the north and greenhouse which adjoins the southern elevation of the dwelling. The garage and greenhouse are to be demolished.

The proposals include two side extensions to the existing dwelling which extend to the ridge height of the existing dwelling and have limited set backs. Given their scale and design the Inspector acknowledged that the degree of subservience of the proposed extensions would therefore be limited and contrary to the general approach advocated in the Council's SPG. However, despite any significant subservience, the extension would provide a larger dwelling, with a balanced symmetrical appearance where the existing gable would remain as a centrepiece. The Inspector considered that whilst the dwelling would be significantly increased in size with higher eaves and ridge height, it would not however appear noticeably tall. Inline with the SPG guidance it was considered by the Inspector that this was an instance where it was appropriate to match the extension to the existing ridge height. The overall design was also considered to be aesthetically pleasing.

On this first issue the Inspector concluded that in the context of the appeal site where there is a wide variety of size, style and appearance in properties, where a number have extended across their plot width, the resulting larger dwelling set back from side boundaries would not stand out incongruously or disrupt any established building pattern.

- 2) The effect on the living conditions of the neighbour at Glebe Cottage, in respect of outlook, light and privacy.

The extension of particular concern to the Council in relation to this issue was that adjoining the neighbouring property to the north, Glebe Cottage. The proposed extensions are to be set in from the side boundaries and as such will be within the building line of the existing dwelling at the front and rear, resulting in a separation distance of some 3.5m between the southern elevation of Glebe Cottage and this particular proposed side

extension. The extensions would have a relatively low height of about 3.4m to the eaves level, with the roof then sloping away to the ridge line. The Inspector considered that notwithstanding the one metre difference in levels between the two neighbouring properties, given the separation distances and the height of the northern side wall of the extension the impact would not be such as to appear overbearing on the outlook from Glebe Cottage.

On the matter of unacceptable overshadowing of habitable rooms, the Inspector considered that on the basis that the definition of habitable rooms outlined in the SPG does not include halls, landings and store rooms or similar spaces, no habitable rooms in the neighbouring property would be affected by the proposed development in this regard. With regard to overshadowing of the private garden of Glebe Cottage, the Inspector outlined that the presence of the extension would not materially increase that currently created by the appeal property on the neighbouring rear garden.

With regard to any effect on the privacy of Glebe Cottage, the Inspector considered that the relationship between the existing south facing former of Glebe Cottage and the proposed northern most dormer on the front of the appeal property deemed inappropriate by the Council was unfounded and would not result in a harmful loss of privacy to Glebe Cottage.

The Inspector concluded to find the development compliant with Policy CS14, ADPP1 and ADPP6 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework and does not fall contrary to the Council's SPG House Extensions.

Conclusion:

For the above reasons the appeal was allowed.