

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/16/3161046

27 Alfred Road, Kingston upon Thames KT1 2UA

- 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 Julia Bennett against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/12434/HOU, dated 14 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as an "increase of roof height to facilitate loft conversion"
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In the interest of clarity I have used the description of development provided on the appeal form in the banner heading above as opposed to that given on the planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2-storey house which forms one half of a Victorian semi-detached pair. Whilst the symmetry of the pair has been partly disrupted by changes to the fenestration in the street frontage, the two properties have pitched roofs that rise to a shared ridge above the party wall between them resulting in a prominent gable frontage. The property is located in a pleasant residential street comprising a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached houses. Whilst these display a range of roof forms – including a number of street-facing gables – the properties are predominately 2-storey so the height and scale of development in this portion of Alfred Road is relatively uniform.
 5. The proposal would comprise raising the roof of the appeal property to enable the formation of additional bedrooms. The same is proposed for the attached property, 29 Alfred Road, which was subject to a separate planning application and a separate appeal has been lodged in conjunction with this one (ref:
-

APP/Z5630/D/16/3161047). As no mechanism has been put forward to facilitate the implementation of both proposals at the same time, each must be considered on its individual merits.

6. Raising the roof of the appeal property would severely disrupt the symmetry of the semi-detached pair. The resulting roof would be notably higher than the vast majority of neighbouring properties, including 25 Alfred Road, which I note has recently been extended at roof level. As a consequence the raised roof would be an overly prominent and incongruous element that would be out of keeping with, and detrimental to, the appearance of the area.
7. For these reasons I conclude that, due to its height, size and prominence the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair and the street scene. It therefore fails to accord with Policies DM10, DM12 and CS8 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Core Strategy (2012) which seek development that relates well to its surroundings and is of a high standard of design. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
8. In coming to this decision I have taken into account my colleague's observations in allowing the planning appeal for a roof addition to No. 25 (ref: APP/Z5630/D/14/2223497). As that case related to a relatively modest detached house with a shallow pitched roof, it is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal, which needs to be considered on its own merits.

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