



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2021

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/21/3276881

5 Tilt Meadow, Cobham, Surrey KT11 3AJ

- 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 Kristian Gray against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0090, dated 12 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part two/part single-storey side/rear extension following demolition of existing rear projection.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part two/part single-storey side/rear extension following demolition of existing rear projection at 5 Tilt Meadow, Cobham, Surrey KT11 3AJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2021/0090, dated 12 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2260-01, 2260-2A, 2260-3, 2260-4A, 2260-5B, 2260-6A, 2260-06A, 2260-7A.
 - 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.
 - 4) All flood mitigation measures shall be carried out in accordance with the details set out in the Flood Risk Assessment dated 4 February 2021.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 6 Tilt Meadow, with particular regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached property. It is located in a residential cul-de-sac comprising houses of similar age and appearance laid out in an informal manner with generally open frontages. The property has an attached garage to the side. The appeal proposal would involve the erection of an additional floor above the garage coupled with some infilling in the space to

the rear of the garage. This would result in additional height and bulk of development close to the boundary shared with the neighbouring house, 6 Tilt Meadow.

4. Whilst No.6 is arranged at an angle to the appeal property, its main windows face garden space to the front and rear and light to, and outlook from, these apertures would be unaffected by the proposal. There are however a pair of ground floor windows that face obliquely towards the appeal site. Natural light to, and outlook from, these windows would be reduced by the proposal. However, these windows were installed as part of the conversion of garage space to living space. The evidence before me indicates they either serve secondary living space or provide natural light to a living area that already benefits from light from elsewhere. As such, the main living spaces within No.6 would retain adequate levels of light and outlook.
5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 6 Tilt Meadow. It therefore accords with Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan (2015). Amongst other matters, these policies require proposals to protect amenity and offer appropriate outlook and adequate daylight and sunlight. I am also satisfied that the proposal accords with the aims of the Council's Companion Guide: Home Extension Supplementary Planning Document (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Conditions

6. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed. The site is within an area at medium risk of surface water flooding. A condition is therefore necessary to require compliance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

S Poole

INSPECTOR