

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/16/3158567

36 Eastbury Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 5AN

- 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 & Mrs Wurzer-Williams against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/12317/HOU dated 1 April 2016 was refused by notice dated 1 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a full back to front loft extension raising the roof to a height of 1150mm, including a dormer window protrusion, enlargement of rear first floor bedroom window, and new window opening to the first floor side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling located in a predominately residential area and identified as being within the Woodside Road/Eastbury Road Local Area of Special Character. The properties in the vicinity of the site consist mainly of closely-spaced detached or semi-detached dwellings. Although there is variation in the roof forms along Eastbury Road, there are distinct groups of properties which have consistent features such as similar eaves and maximum roof heights as well as similar facing materials. These features, alongside the use of bay windows, recessed porches and traditional architectural detailing gives the area a pleasing, unifying character.
 4. The proposal seeks to raise the existing roof by around 1.15m to enable a loft conversion and a dormer extension to one side of the roof. The increase in the height of the roof would result in a marked difference in appearance with the adjacent properties. Although the appellant states that the eaves line differs from property to property, I was able to see that the appeal property's eaves has a broadly similar line to those either side at No's 34 and 38 Eastbury Road, which form a group of similar properties. Reference has been made to properties on Lower Ham Road and whilst these are located close to the appeal
-

property and their rear elevations can be seen alongside views of the appeal site, the appeal building is more closely associated with the adjacent properties at No's 34 and 38. These are orientated in the same direction fronting Eastbury Road than those on Lower Ham Road which are visually more separate due to their positioning at right angles to the appeal site. The proposed increase in height of the proposal would appear intrusive in views along Eastbury Road, where the consistent roofscape amongst this group of similar properties contributes to the cohesive character.

5. Many of the properties on Eastbury Road and others nearby have been subject to roof alterations following loft conversions, and I was able to see some of the referenced cases at the time of my site visit. This includes similar developments at No's 52 and 54 Lower Ham Road. Although the detailed planning circumstances of these cases are not before me, it appears that this referenced section of Lower Ham Road (No's 50- 56) contains some properties which are more substantial than those immediately adjacent to and including the appeal property. In other cases, I consider the examples quoted do little to support the proposal and serve to demonstrate the harm that would be caused by the appeal scheme.
6. I accept that the proposal has been designed with careful detailing to the proposed fenestration, would utilise traditional materials and the roof would match the existing. I do not however consider that the development would compliment, conserve or enhance the existing built environment due to the visual impact of the additional height of the roof. The dormer element of the proposal, whilst being visible from the street, is set back from the frontage and given its size and material finishing, I do not consider that in itself this or the proposed rooflights would have an unacceptable visual impact.
7. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above, I consider the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thereby conflict with The London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6, Policies CS 8 and DM 10 of the Council's Core Strategy and the *Residential Design* Supplementary Planning Document, which require, amongst other matters, good design that relates well to its surroundings. It would also conflict with Chapter 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks, amongst other matters, high quality design.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including that it would in terms of access comply with relevant Codes of Practice and Building Regulations, is not located within a conservation area or is a listed building and representations objecting to the proposal, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR