



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 31 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/16/3154800

62 Thorkhill Road, Thames Ditton, Surrey, KT17 0UG.

- 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 Toby Mayers against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0698, dated 26 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey rear extension-second floor rear extension-loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension-second floor rear extension-loft conversion at 62 Thorkhill Road, Thames Ditton, Surrey, KT17 0UG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2016/0698, dated 26 February 2016, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings numbered: M153/015/001, 002, 003, 004C, 005D, M153/016/006 and a location plan scale 1:1250 dated 8 July 2015.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 60 Thorkhill Road, in terms of the potential for the proposed rear extensions to appear overbearing.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, number 62 Thorkhill Road, is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling house. It has previously been extended by way of both a single and two-storey rear addition. The attached dwelling, number 60, is located to the north of number 62 and has an existing deep single storey rear extension.

4. Following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension, the proposal is to build a new single storey rear extension, second floor rear addition with rooms in the roof space, rear dormer window incorporating a Juliet balcony and side rooflight.
5. The proposed single storey extension would be the same width as the host property and would project about 7.0 metres into the rear garden space. It would be set back from the common boundary to number 60 for the depth of the two-storey outrigger to form a courtyard light well. Its height along the line of the boundary to number 60 would be about 2.0 metres with the roof sloping up and away from the boundary at 25 degrees to a flat roof with a parapet height of about 3.3 metres from finished ground level.
6. The proposed single storey addition would extend about 1.3 metres or so further to the rear than that at number 60. That extension, which is set about 1.1 metres or so in from the boundary, has two high level slit windows and two narrow deeper windows in the southern elevation facing number 62. The existing extension to the rear of number 64 would not impact on daylight levels at number 60 due to the separation distance. Nevertheless it is already likely, along with the boundary fencing, to have some impact on sunlight to number 60.
7. I do not consider, for the following reasons, that any loss of sun/daylight to any habitable spaces in the single storey extension to number 60 would be so significant as to result in harm to residential living conditions. These include the setback of the extension at number 60 from the boundary to number 62; the limited height of the proposed extension in relation to a typical 1.8 to 2.0 metres high boundary fence; the shallow pitch of the proposed roof and the set back to the flat roofed element of the single storey extension; and the depth and proportions of the windows in the side wall of the existing addition at number 60.
8. Furthermore, given the limited size and proportions of the windows in the side wall of the extension at number 60, and while having regard to the considerations set out above as well as the overall size of the private amenity space, I do not consider that the extension would necessarily have the overbearing impact suggested by the Council.
9. The proposed creation of a light well at ground floor level would, in my judgement, result in a limited loss of further light to the room served by what the Council has referred to as the internal rear window at ground floor level in the rear wall of number 60. Accordingly I do not believe, based on the limited detail provided to the contrary, that the loss of natural light would be such as to cause harm to the living conditions of the users of that room.
10. The Council raises no concerns in regard to the impact of the proposed second storey extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of number 60. Given the location of the first and second floor additions to the boundary to number 60 and the limited depth of those extensions, I concur with its view.
11. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed addition, if it were to go ahead, would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 60 Thorkhill Road, in terms of appearing overbearing. The proposal therefore accords with Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan-

Development Management Plan (Adopted April 2015), Policies CS8 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (Adopted July 2011), Elmbridge Borough Council's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document Companion Guide: *Home Extensions* (Adopted April 2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to the protection of residential living conditions.

Conditions

12. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development I have included a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR