

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2016

by Megan Thomas Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/16/3154485

Gable Cottage, Church Lane Avenue, Coulsdon CR5 3RT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Declan Davis against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00810/HHOLD, dated 8 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension over existing single storey side extension to create a new bedroom/ensuite/dressing room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension over existing single storey side extension to create a new bedroom/ensuite/dressing room in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00810/HHOLD, dated 8 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: PLN01, PLN02, PLN03, PLN04, PLN05, PLN06, PLN07 & PLN08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached house and garden situated in the settlement of Hooley. The house sits in a corner plot on the north side of Church Lane and
-

the west side of Church Lane Avenue. It is a two storey dwelling and has a detached garage to the north. Its closest neighbour is to the north and that is a two storey dwelling at 1 Church Lane Avenue.

4. The proposal comprises a first floor extension over an existing single pitched single storey extension to the east side of the dwelling. The extension would be flush with the existing ground floor flank wall. The distance from the Church Lane Avenue boundary of the curtilage would be about 2.7m at ground level at the closest point, as it is now. The proposed design would complement the existing house, improving its overall appearance.
5. The proposed first floor extension would result in a change to the visual perception of the streetscene because, at first floor and roof level, it would sit noticeably forward of the front elevations of the row of houses to the north of the appeal site. However, in this particular case, I am of the view that the change would not be so harmful as to warrant refusal of permission. The front elevation of Gable Cottage is orientated towards the south and the Cottage is of a design and form clearly different to its immediate neighbours. Moreover, streetscene views of the proposed extension would generally be filtered by vegetation or viewed against a backdrop of some vegetation. With use of appropriate materials, which can be secured by condition, I do not consider the pattern of development in the area or the quality of the streetscene would be materially diminished. Overall I do not consider that the extension would dominate the streetscene. A reasonable separation distance would be maintained between the flank elevation of Gable Cottage and Church Lane Avenue.
6. I have had regard to advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance *Householder Extensions and Alterations*. However, there is nothing in that guidance that leads me to conclude that in this particular location and in the circumstances of this case the proposal should not be allowed.
7. On this main issue I conclude therefore that the proposed development would not materially the harm the character or appearance of the streetscene. There would be no conflict with policies Ho9, Ho13 or Ho16 of the Reigate and Banstead Borough Plan 2005.

Other Matters

8. The proposed extension would have one small window in the first floor rear elevation but given the separation distance between that window and the flank and front elevations of 1 Church Lane Avenue I do not consider the living conditions of the occupants of that property would be detrimentally affected. There are no other potential impacts of the proposal that I consider would be unacceptably harmful.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested some conditions in the event that the appeal might be successful and I have considered those in the light of PPG and the model

conditions. In the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition which ties the development to the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, there is a condition requiring external surface materials used in the extension to match those used on the host dwelling.

Conclusion

10. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I allow the appeal.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR