
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2017

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/16/3160635

5 Park Farm Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 5TQ

- 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 Neil Fuller against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/12548/HOU, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a garage conversion, erection of new rear extension in place of existing smaller rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a garage conversion, erection of new rear extension in place of existing smaller rear extension at 5 Park Farm Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 5TQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/12548/HOU, dated 19 May 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following 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: 362-OS-001; 362-OS-002; 362-GA-100-A; 362-SK-110-B; 362-GA-200-B; 362-GA-210-B; 362-GA-211.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house on the northern side of Park Road. It has an existing single storey extension to the rear. The rear of the building is set back from the rear of the adjacent property at No 7, which has also been extended along the boundary.
 4. The submitted plans indicate that the extension would project around 8 metres from the rear of the property, although the current extension accounts for
-

more than half of that depth. In this regard, the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2013) states that extensions should generally not exceed 3-3.5 metres in depth. However, Policy Guidance 33 of that document also states that "*if the neighbouring property has a different rear building line then the depth of the extension could be increased*". In this case, the adjacent property at No 7 Park Farm Road has a deeper rear building line, and has also been extended along the boundary. The development would be of a comparable length to this extension, and so would be in keeping with the adjacent property. The height of the proposed extension would be similar to the height of the existing extension to No 7, and would not be significantly taller than the existing boundary fence with No 3. Whilst it would be slightly above the maximum height specified in the Residential Design SPD, no harm would arise in this case. In this context, and given the depth of the existing extension to No 5, the development would not appear disproportionately large or insubordinate to the host property.

5. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be in accordance with Policy DM10 of the Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy (2012). This policy seeks to ensure that new development respects the character of the local area.

Conditions

6. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary for clarity and to ensure a satisfactory development. I have also imposed a condition that requires the external materials of the extension to match the existing building. This is necessary in order to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR