
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/16/3161583

4A Thetford Road, New Malden, Kingston upon Thames, KT3 5DN

- 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 David Wilson against the decision of The Council of The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 15/15387/HOU dated 21 December 2015 was refused by notice dated 22 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is facade re-modelling with front extension, loft conversion and rear ground floor extension of 2.2m with new front garden wall, fence and gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for facade re-modelling with front extension, loft conversion and rear ground floor extension of 2.2m with new front garden wall, fence and gate at 4A Thetford Road, New Malden, Kingston upon Thames, KT3 5DN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 15/15387/HOU dated 21 December 2015 subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house, which is situated on the northern side of Thetford Road, in an area which consists of a mix of large Edwardian properties and smaller, infill dwellings. The buildings sit within generous plots and on building lines which are slightly staggered but which generally follow the curvature in the road. Despite the variance in the size of properties, many have features such as bay windows, gable fronts and predominantly make use of render and brick as facing materials. These features, alongside low boundary walls and mature planting within front garden areas, as well as the presence of street trees, contribute to the pleasant residential character of the area.
 4. Both the Council and the Appellant agree that the existing building detracts from the character and appearance of the area. There is no objection either
-

from the Council to the front building line of the proposal. The current building has a noticeably shallower roof than either of the adjacent properties and I consider the alterations to increase the pitch and the height of the roof and broadly retain the existing eaves height, would be sympathetic to the site's immediate context.

5. The Council raise concerns relating to the detailed design and fenestration of the intended development. The proposal would have a central two-storey projecting element at the front. I acknowledge that this would have a differing design to other gable fronts in the area and would in particular have a large amount of glazing. However, this element of the appeal application would have a vertical emphasis reflecting the predominant surrounding built form and the dark coloured transoms and mullions would reflect the grey and black painted timber on neighbouring buildings. The first-floor windows either side of the central two-storey element would also have similar vertical divisions to that of a neighbouring property's window.
6. Although the Council state that the building materials do not relate to the surroundings, it was clear from my site observations and from the contextual analysis provided by the appellant, that the use of white render and the selection of red bricks, are similar to those on properties in the vicinity of the site.
7. I agree with Council that the design detailing when adopting a contemporary approach needs to be carefully considered and that the appeal building is seen in close proximity to its neighbours. Although they state that the quality is currently missing from the proposed development, I consider the different design elements that form the proposal would complement the character of the area and rather than representing a piecemeal approach, would demonstrate how a contemporary design approach can be successful in responding to local character. Reference has been made to how water run-off would be executed but I have not been provided with specific information on why the proposal would be unacceptable in this regard.
8. The Council raise no objections to other elements of the scheme, including the design of the boundary treatment, rear extension or the rear dormer extension and I have no reason to disagree with this position.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property or the area. It would not conflict with Policies CS 8, DM 10 and DM 11 of the Council's Core Strategy or Policy Guidance 38 of the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document which is particularly relevant to the proposal. These seek, amongst other matters, high quality development that reinforces or enhances local identity. It would also not conflict with Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks high quality design.

Other Matters

10. Concerns have been raised in relation to the overshadowing effect and on the outlook of No. 4 Thetford Road that would arise from the appeal application. Given the single storey nature of the extensions closest to the boundary of this neighbouring property and their limited projections, I do not consider that the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers would be adversely affected in these

respects. The large window on the western elevation of the proposal is identified as being obscure glazed and this is a matter which can be controlled by condition.

11. I also note the concerns expressed including in relation to noise and disruption during the construction period but this would be of a temporary duration. I have taken into account all other matters raised, including in relation to Building Regulations and access that would be required to the neighbour's property to undertake the works subject of this application, but for the reasons set out above, these do not alter my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above and having taken into account all other matters raised, including matters relating to sustainable design and the location of the site adjacent to a Conservation Area, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

13. The Council have suggested a number of conditions. I consider the standard implementation condition and a condition for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to be necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I will impose a condition requiring material samples to be submitted to the local planning authority for approval in the interests of the character and appearance of the host building and area.
14. Conditions are also necessary for glazing in the large side-facing window on the western elevation of the property to be obscure glazed, to prevent new windows or openings on the side elevations of the development hereby approved and to restrict the use of the roof area of the extensions to protect the living conditions of surrounding residential occupiers. The wording of some of the conditions has been amended without changing their overall effect.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Proposed Site (Block) Plan 4A TR/P 010, Proposed Ground Floor Plan 4A TR/P 011A, Proposed First Floor Plan 4A TR/P 012A, Proposed Front Elevation (South) 4A TR/P 014B, Proposed Side Elevation (East) 4A TR/P 015C, Proposed Section A-A 4A TR/ P 018B, Existing Site (Block) Plan 4A TR/P 002, Existing Ground Floor Plan 4A TR/ P 003, Existing First Floor Plan 4A TR/ P 004, Existing Front Elevation (South) 4A TR/ P 005, Existing Side Elevation (East) 4A TR/ P 006, Existing Side Elevation (West) 4A TR/ P 007, Existing Rear Elevation (North) 4A TR/ P 008, Existing Section A-A 4A TR/ P 009, Proposed Loft Plan 4A TR/ P 013 C,

Proposed Site Elevation (East) 4A TR/ P 015B, Proposed Site Elevation (West) 4A TR/ P 016D, Proposed Rear Elevation North 4A TR/ P 017C, Proposed Front – Front Elevation (Front Garden Wall) (South) 4A TR/ P 019B, Proposed Roof Plan (sheet 1 of 2) 4A TR/ P 022B, Proposed Aerial View 4A TR / P023, Proposed Perspective View 4A TR / P024 and Proposed Perspective View 4A TR / P 025.

- 3) No development shall take place until samples and details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) The roof area of the extensions hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.
- 5) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification), no window or other opening (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be formed in the first floor side (east and west) elevations of the development hereby permitted.
- 6) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the window (between bedrooms 2 & 3) on the western side elevation of the development has been fitted with obscured glazing. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed, the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.