

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/17/3168443

230 Park Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 5LS

- 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 John Saville against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/12982/HOU, dated 26 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part two storey side and roof extension to create enlarged loft with installation of two roof lights and the erection of side and rear extension to link outbuilding to main building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the planning application form; I note the Appellant also uses this description on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling with an unusual box-like structure at roof level towards the rear giving some added loft space and access out to a flat roof above an added two storey side element. The original elevations of the semi-detached pair can be seen as pleasing but symmetry is no longer an attribute as marked change has occurred to both houses. The locality is an established residential area of suburban character with a range of house types which generally come together to give an area with a pleasing appearance and a sense of some spaciousness. The proposal is as described above.
 5. I can understand why one might wish to link an existing outbuilding standing some way away from the main dwelling to the home for practical and increased accommodation purposes. However the difficulty is that these works, along with other single storey flat roofed planned development, combined with an
-

existing structure which would read as part of the house rather than a separate form, would all lead to a conglomeration of excessive footprint and depth of development away from the home such as to be disproportionate to that dwelling and far from subordinate in appearance. The aesthetic qualities of the property would be eroded and unbalanced.

6. In terms of the two storey side proposal and the roof alterations, a case could be made that the use of pitched roofing might be seen as a visual improvement over the existing somewhat alien flat roof and roof access arrangement. However this would not be some modest addition; it would represent major additions which in themselves would overwhelm the original dwelling. The volume and mass of roof would increase most markedly as would the amount of two storey vertical walling right along the common side boundary. For the most part the locality is one which benefits from two storey structures being kept clear of boundaries and whilst this dwelling is already one of the exceptions the scheme would be a step too far on this matter in my opinion.
7. In all the circumstances the proposed changes would be harmful to the character and appearance of this property and wider locality; the scheme would simply represent inappropriate over-development.
8. Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy call for, amongst other matters, well designed development, appropriate to its site and setting and of a suitable scale, appearance and character which would protect local distinctiveness and qualities of suburban properties. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies which mirror objectives embodied in the Council's Residential Design SPD 2013.

Other matters

9. I sympathise with the Appellant's wish to modernise and increase the extent of family accommodation at this property. I recognise that no neighbours objected and that there may have been some, without prejudice, encouragement in pre-application dialogue. 'Permitted development' rights might allow some extension works at the dwelling but I am determining the overall scheme before me and on the evidence provided I would not deem any such rights to form a material 'fall-back' position. I understand that works may be progressing to the adjoining property but I am not persuaded that a planning permission for different development on one side of the boundary should lead to the appeal scheme being allowed. I am assessing this case on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
10. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered. Key objectives of the document are to safeguard qualities of the built environment and the development plan policies which I cite mirror these.

Overall conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR