

EAST ILSLEY 14/00203 Pins Ref 2217888	1 Orchard Lea Old Stanmore Road, East Ilsley Mr and Mrs Storrer	Single storey rear extension	Delegated Refusal	Dismissed 27.6.2014
--	--	---------------------------------	-------------------	------------------------

Main Issue

The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of No.1 Narborough Lane and No.2 Orchard Lea with regard to visual impact and loss of light respectively.

Reasons

Effects on No.1 Narborough Lane

The appeal property is a detached two storey house located within the East Ilsley Conservation Area (the CA) and the wider North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB). Due to the local topography, No.1 Orchard Lea is set above the rear of No.1 Narborough Lane to the east. The proposed extension would span the northern elevation of the appeal property at a depth of some 4m and would have a lean-to roof with a maximum height of some 4.4m. Whilst it would be screened to some degree by an existing boundary fence and mature planting, the proposed extension would nonetheless be clearly visible from the rear of No.1 Narborough Lane. Due to its elevated position and additional bulk, it would appear overbearing when viewed from that position and particularly so from the outside space directly to the rear of that property. This would result in an increased sense of enclosure that would significantly reduce the enjoyment of that space and cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers.

Effects on No.2 Orchard Lea

Due to the off-set positioning of No.1 and No.2 Orchard Lea, the proposed extension would fail to satisfy the 60° guideline set out in the Council's House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (2004) and would reduce the amount of sunlight reaching the rear garden at No.2 during the morning to some degree. However, it would be largely screened by existing boundary treatments and the Inspector was satisfied that coupled with the pitch of its roof this would ensure that the change would not be significant and would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers in this respect.

Other Matters

The Council's Case Officer raised concerns regarding the design of the proposed extension. However, this issue did not form a reason for refusal and given the subservient scale of the proposed extension and the use of matching materials, the Inspector agreed with the Council's Conservation Officer that it would not harm the appearance of the main building or the locality. He was therefore content that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of both the CA and the wider AONB.

The Inspector took account of representations from the occupier of No.1 Narborough Lane with regard to loss of light at that property. However, taking into account the separation between the two houses and their orientation, he was satisfied that any reduction in the amount of sunlight reaching No.1 Narborough Lane would not be significant and would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers. Whilst he had therefore found the scheme to be acceptable in some respects, this does not serve to outweigh the significant harm identified above.

Conclusion

The proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012) which, among other things, seeks to ensure that development provides a good standard of amenity for all current and future occupiers of land and buildings. The contents of the National Planning Practice Guidance (2014) have been considered, but in light of the facts in this case they do not alter my conclusions.

For these reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, the Inspector concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

DC