



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2020 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/19/3238949

4 St Anns Road, Chertsey KT16 9DG

- 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 Mrs Susannah Robertson against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref RU.19/0079, dated 15 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey rear extension to accommodate an additional bedroom upstairs and additional living space downstairs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey rear extension to accommodate an additional bedroom upstairs and additional living space downstairs at 4 St Anns Road, Chertsey KT16 9DG in accordance with the application, Ref RU.19/0079, dated 15 January 2019 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 approved plans: 1180-100, 1180-101, 1180-105, 1180-106, 1180-111 (Revision A), 1180-116 (Revision A), 1180-120, 1180-130, 1180-131, 1180-140 and 1180-141.
 - 4) Spoil or building materials generated by the development shall not be deposited or stored within the area of the site within Flood Zone 2 or 3a.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 6 St Anns Road with regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling. No 6 St Anns Road adjoins the appeal property to the west. Both properties benefit from relatively large back gardens and have been previously extended. At the rear, No 6 features a single storey conservatory. The main two storey element of the house is set slightly further back compared to No 4 and it has two rear facing first floor windows.
5. The appeal property currently has a single storey rear extension built close to the boundary fence with No 6. The proposed two storey extension would utilise the flank wall of this existing extension facing No 6 and so have the same depth and be no closer to No 6 than the existing single storey extension.
6. The proposal would be higher than the existing extension and would be clearly visible from the first floor windows of No 6. However the ridge height and eaves of the extension would sit lower than the existing ridge height and eaves of both dwellings and importantly the eaves height is comparable to the cill level of the first floor windows of No 6. As such views from these neighbouring windows would primarily be of a sloping roof and so a largely unobstructed outlook would be maintained. I also note that it has been demonstrated by the appellant, and accepted by the Council, that there would not be a significant impact on the levels of daylight or sunlight received by No 6 and I have no reason to disagree with that conclusion. Overall, I do not consider the proposed extension would be so large or prominent that it would unduly dominate outlook or feel overbearing from No 6.
7. The proposed development would accord with Policy HO9 of the Runnymede Borough Local Plan Second Alteration 2001 and the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure proposals avoid damaging local amenity, and provide appropriate space between dwellings and adequate daylight and sunlight. The proposal is also not contrary to the Householder Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance (July 2003) which states that extensions should not significantly harm the outlook of neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

8. The appeal property is located opposite the boundary of Chertsey Conservation Area. The Council raise no concerns in respect of the effect of the development on the setting of this conservation area and, as the development is to the rear of the property, I agree.

Conditions

9. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. Where necessary, and in the interests of clarity and precision, I have slightly altered the conditions to better reflect the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the area.

11. The Council advise that the front of the site is within flood Zones 2 and 3a and have suggested conditions to minimise flood risk. I have not included the suggested conditions requiring that the floor level of the proposed development must be set no lower than existing or that it must include flood proofing, or that any steps or ramps must have an open construction as the part of the site where the extension would be constructed is outside these flood zones. Similarly the condition relating to the construction of soakaways is unnecessary as no soakaways are proposed. The suggested condition requiring that spoil or building materials shall not be deposited or stored within the flood risk area has been included as such material could feasibly be stored at the front of the property and its inclusion will ensure no increased risk of flooding occurs.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR