
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2016

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/16/3159145

3 Broomhill, Ewshot, Farnham, Surrey, GU10 5BE.

- 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 Michael Phillips against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application, ref: 16/00621/HOU, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear extension and new front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear extension and new front porch at 3 Broomhill, Ewshot, Farnham, Surrey, GU10 5BE, in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 16/00621/HOU, dated 9 March 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 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:

Drawing no. 1503-001.P2:	Location Plan – scale 1:1250; Block Plan – scale 1:500.
Drawing no. 1503-100.P1:	Existing Ground and First Floor Plans – scale 1:100.
Drawing no. 1503-140.P1:	Existing West and East Elevations – scale 1:100.
Drawing no. 1503-141.P1:	Existing North Elevation – scale 1:100.
Drawing no. 1503-200.5.P3:	Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans – scale 1:100.
Drawing no. 1503-202.5.P2:	Proposed Second Floor and Roof Plans – scale 1:100.
-

Drawing no. 1503-300.5.P1: Proposed Section A-A – scale 1:50.

Drawing no. 1503-400.5.P3: Proposed East and West Elevations – scale 1:100.

Drawing no. 1503-401.5.P2: Proposed North Elevation – scale 1:100.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the living conditions of existing and future residents of 2 and 4 Broomhill.

Reasons

3. 3 Broomhill comprises a modest, semi-detached house that was erected during the inter-war period and being located at the head of a cul-de-sac containing a mix of similar houses together with more recent houses and bungalows. There is an existing single storey rear addition, which was probably erected when the house was constructed. This would be demolished to permit the erection of a part single storey and part two storey extension that would project rearwards marginally further than the existing back addition.
4. As part of my site visit I was requested to have particular regard to the impact of the scheme upon the neighbouring properties at 2 and 4 Broomhill.
5. The extension has been carefully designed, such that the two storey element is sited away from the common boundaries on either side. It also incorporates a hipped roof to the rear elevation.
6. 4 Broomhill has been the subject of a single storey infill extension that projects up to the common boundary with no. 3. It has a lean-to roof that slopes downwards towards no. 3. The proposed single storey extension incorporates a similar lean-to roof. The new structure would project rearwards further than the extension to no. 4. However, given the existence of mature boundary treatment this element of the scheme would not impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of that property.
7. The two storey element of the scheme is set away from the common boundary with no. 4, whose rear-facing bedroom window is set in from the boundary. Although it may marginally impact upon the 45 degree rule, I am nevertheless satisfied that there would be no unacceptable loss of outlook to that window. Furthermore, having regard to its siting to the south of the appeal site there would be no loss of sunlight or daylight resulting from the scheme before me.
8. In the case of 2 Broomhill, that property is set well forward of the rear building line of no. 3. As such, neither the single storey nor the two storey elements of the proposal would impact upon the outlook from its rear-facing windows. Given the off-set of the two storey element of the scheme from the common boundary and the existence of fencing and a garage or shed within the garden of no. 2, I am also satisfied that there would be no loss of daylight or sunlight to the habitable room windows or the private garden area of that property.
9. For all of these reasons I have found upon the main issue that development as proposed would not be harmful to the living conditions of existing or future

occupiers of 2 and 4 Broomhill, as required by “saved” Policies GEN 1 (iii) and URB 16 (ii) of the Local Plan¹.

Other Matters

10. The front porch would replicate that built on the adjoining property, such that there is apparently no objection to this element of the proposal.
11. The Council has raised concerns relating to the inclusion of three roof lights to the front roof slope, which would be visible on approaching the property from Church Road. Nevertheless, I note that permission has recently been granted for a scheme at no. 3 which incorporates two roof lights (ref: 16/00139/HOU dated 16 March 2016).
12. Given the relatively modest size of these roof lights and the existence of large solar panels to the front roof slopes of several of the houses nearby, I can see no objection to the inclusion of a third roof light as proposed.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested three conditions should I be minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by the Government’s Planning Practice Guidance issued on 6 March 2014 and find all to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. My reasons for the conditions are:
14. Condition 1 is the standard commencement condition imposed in accordance with section 91(1) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Condition 2 will ensure a satisfactory appearance to the completed development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
15. Condition 3, which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, provides certainty.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

¹ Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and First Alterations to the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 (April 2009).