

Appeal Decision

Site: 23 Windmill Lane, Epsom KT17 3AE

Proposal: Proposed first floor rear extension with gable roof and increase in ridge height to facilitate loft conversion with three rear dormers.

Application Number: 16/01890/FLH

Decision: Appeal dismissed

Grounds for Refusal:

1 The proposed first floor rear extension, rear dormers and raised ridge height would result in a large, bulky, gable-ended roof extension which would be out of character with the prevailing development typology of this group of three bungalows and therefore it would fail to contribute to the attractive character and local distinctiveness of the existing street scene. As a result it fails to make a positive contribution to the borough's visual character and appearance and is contrary to policies DM9, DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015 and policy CS5 of the Core Strategy 2007 and it fails to be guided by the principles of the Householder Applications - Design Guidance 2004.

2 The proposed rear roof extension and new dormer windows, by reason of their size, number and location, would introduce a significant element of overlooking to adjoining properties and would result in a loss of privacy to Nos 25 Windmill Lane and 1 Chelwood Close contrary to policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015 and the principles of the Householder Applications - Design Guidance 2004.

3 The proposed extensions would result in a raised ridge height and large, gable-ended roof extension which, by reason of its significant height and bulk, in relation to that of the adjoining bungalow at No.25, would be unneighbourly and would have an unacceptable overbearing impact on this property contrary to policy DM10 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015.

Summary of Decision:

- 1. The Inspector upheld ground 1, and concluded that the proposed loft/roof conversion would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.**
- 2. However he did not agree that the scheme would have a harmful impact on living conditions (Grounds 2 and 3), and stated**

that “the overlooking of this property is of a form that is not unusual in residential areas. Consequently, that overlooking would not have a material effect on the living conditions of occupiers of that neighbouring property.”

and furthermore “ the proposed increase in height of the rear elevation, along with gable ended roof, would be visible from that neighbouring property. However, in the context of the relationship with the living conditions of those neighbouring occupiers, the increase in height is not excessive and the set back is small. As a result, it would not materially affect the outlook of the neighbouring property”.