



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2021

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 18 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/20/3260311

48 Priory Lane, West Molesey, KT8 2PS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Schedule 2, Part 1, Paragraph A4 of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Ms Paula Medeiros against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1574, dated 2 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises - taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made in the same manner.

Reasons

3. The proposed single storey extension would project approximately 6 metres from the main rear wall of the house and across its full width to a maximum height of approximately 3.4m. The rear boundary fence between 48 Priory Lane and the neighbouring property, 157 Beauchamp Road, is set at an angle because of the siting of the latter on the corner of Priory Lane and Beauchamp Road. The side wall of the proposed extension would continue the building line of the side wall of the existing house up to the point at which it would meet the boundary fence. It would then continue along on the boundary.
4. The existing boundary fence is approximately 2m high and therefore gives a sense of enclosure to the occupants of No.157. I consider that the height of the proposed extension, together with its width and length, and proximity to the boundary would result in an increased sense of enclosure. This would be particularly marked because of the angled siting of No.157 in relation to No.48 and the location of ground floor windows serving habitable rooms in No.157.

5. I conclude that the proposal would appear overbearing in the outlook from No.157 and cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of the occupiers by reason of its siting, height and overall size.

Conclusion

6. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR