

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/16/3162545

4 Aragon Road, Kingston upon Thames, KT2 5QE

- 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 and Mrs Andreas Isfort against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/12700/HOU, dated 1 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effects of the proposal on:
 - (i) the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 Aragon Road, with particular regard to outlook and natural light; and
 - (ii) the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey terraced house which is situated in a residential street comprising houses of similar age and appearance. At the rear the property has a modest single-storey element and a double-storey bay. This arrangement is mirrored to the rear of the properties to either side. Like its neighbours, the appeal property benefits from a relatively long garden.
 4. The proposal would comprise a full-width single storey extension. This would protrude a significant distance beyond the main rear elevation resulting in the formation of a long flank wall on the boundary shared with 2 Aragon Road. This would be very close to the ground floor bay window which provides light to, and allows outlook from, a habitable room. Whilst I am satisfied that a sufficient amount of natural light reaching the bay window would be maintained, due to its height and rear protrusion the proposal would severely enclose and reduce outlook from the ground floor room.
-

5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 2. It therefore conflicts with Policy DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Core Strategy (2012) (CS) which, amongst other matters, expects development proposals to have regard to the amenities of neighbours including in terms of outlook and visual intrusion.

Character and appearance

6. Whilst I note that properties in the street have been extended at the rear, those properties immediately neighbouring the appeal property retain their original arrangement. In this particular context the proposal would be an incongruous addition to the terrace out of keeping with its neighbours. Due to its siting and size I conclude that the proposal would also have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the group of which it forms part.
7. The proposal therefore fails to comply with CS Policies DM10 and CS8 which seek development that relates well to its surroundings. There is also conflict with the design principles set out in the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013), which include respecting the prevailing development typology.

Other matters

8. In coming to these conclusions I have taken into account the potential for the appellant to construct a smaller rear addition than that before me by virtue of the rights provided by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. In the absence of a prior approval I attach limited weight to the possibility of the appellant being able to erect a larger rear addition than currently proposed under the provisions of the Order.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR