

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/16/3163950
15 Surbiton Hill Park, Surbiton KT5 8EW

- 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 Mrs A Lenihan against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/16589/HOU, dated 15 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear and 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the erection of a single storey rear and 2 storey side extension at 15 Surbiton Hill Park, Surbiton KT5 8EW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/16589/HOU, dated 15 August 2016, 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: Site Location Plan; Block Plan; suhp-0152-0; suhp-0152-1; suhp-0152-2; suhp-0152-3; suhp-0152-4; suhp-0152-5; suhp-0152-6; suhp-0152-7 and suhp-0152-8.
 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.

Procedural Matter

2. Although originally proposed to be an access required site visit the property and surrounding area were visited on an unaccompanied basis.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling situated at the junction of Surbiton Hill Park and Pembroke Avenue and is located within a primarily residential area that includes a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. The other property forming this pair of semi-detached dwellings (150 Surbiton Hill Park) has been altered by a hip to gable roof extension which includes a large dormer within the rear roofslope. These alterations to the adjoining property mean that there is already a disruption of the original symmetrical appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings.
5. The Planning Officer's report refers to a Lawful Development Certificate being issued for the property (Ref 16/16436/LDP) for the erection of a rear dormer. The details of this potential development have not been provided but, if erected, there would be an effect on the character of the property and appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. Moderate weight has been given to the changes which might occur.
6. There are other examples of other semi-detached dwellings having been altered, including 70 Pembroke Avenue where a 2-storey side extension has been erected. This enlarged dwelling is located on the opposite side of the junction from the appeal property and the extension has neither been set back from the original dwelling's front elevation nor erected with a lower ridge height than the original roof. The full planning circumstances of the alterations at No. 70 have not been provided and, for this reason, limited weight has been given to this other scheme in the determination of this appeal. However, as with other near-by altered properties, No. 70 does contribute to the variety of dwelling types, designs and sizes within the surrounding area.
7. The proposed development includes a single storey rear extension and a 2-storey side extension. As noted by the Council, the pitched roof of the proposed rear extension would be seen above the wooden fence which defines the property's boundary with Pembroke Avenue. However, this roof and the associated rear extension would not be unduly prominent additions that would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the property, the streetscene along Pembroke Avenue or the surrounding residential area. In reaching this judgement account has been taken of the proposed rear extension being viewed alongside the alterations to No. 150 which, by reason of elevation, are visually more dominant.
8. The design of the proposed 2-storey side extension would not fully accord with the Council's *Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD), in particular the front elevation would not be set back from the property's existing front elevation and the width of this element of the appeal scheme would be more than half the width of the host property. However, the SPD's householder development section is additional guidance for those looking to extend or alter their existing homes and it is acknowledged the SPD cannot anticipate every eventuality.
9. There would be the loss of some of the side garden because the proposed extension would be more than half the width of the host property. However, the character of the area around the junction would be respected by remaining open and spacious rather than any unacceptable sense of enclosure caused by

parts of the proposed extension's 2-storey flank wall being sited closer to the shared boundary than the original property. Further, by reason of the separation distance between the dwellings fronting the north side of Pembroke Avenue and the enlarged appeal property, there would be no unacceptable disruption caused to the existing building line along the road.

10. As already noted, the symmetry of these semi-detached dwellings has been disrupted by the alterations to the roof of No. 150. The ridge height of the proposed side extension would be materially lower than the existing roof and, even without the setting back of the front elevation, this would give the appearance of this element of the appeal scheme being subservient to the host property.
11. The design of the proposed front elevation seeks to replicate the existing 2-storey bay windows with a gable roof above which would provide some harmony or continuity in the appearance of the enlarged dwelling. A condition could be imposed on any successful appeal to ensure that matching external materials were used to construct the proposed development as indicated on the submitted drawings.
12. Overall, although the enlarged property would be visible from the adjacent roads, the proposed development would not result in an incongruous or unacceptably conspicuous form of development because of the variety of dwellings within the surrounding area, the alterations at No. 150, the retained spaciousness at the junction and the design of the appeal scheme, including the replication of the bay windows and the subservience associated with the roof. For these reasons, it is concluded that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and, as such, it would not conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy. Amongst other matters these policies require development to be of a good design which respects the character and local distinctiveness of the street or area, including consideration of layout, height, form, massing, building lines and plot width. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design.

Other Matters

13. I have note the comments of local residents concerning parking, the appeal scheme being an overbearing form of development and the implications of the construction of the proposed extensions. However, the Council has not objected to the appeal scheme on these grounds and there are no reasons for me to adopt a different assessment from the Council.

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested conditions in the event this appeal succeeds and they have been assessed against the tests contained in the Framework and the National Planning Practice Guidance. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning a condition requiring the proposed development to be erected in accordance with the approved drawings is necessary. For reasons of precision, the suggested condition concerning the use of external materials can be simplified.

15. The Council has suggested a condition concerning the roof of the proposed extension not being used as a balcony or sitting out area. However, the proposed roof forms make such a condition unnecessary in this case. Accordingly, and taking all other matters into account including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be allowed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR