
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2017

by David Walker MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/W/16/3164058

15 Cambridge Road, Kingston upon Thames KT1 3NG

- 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 Mohan Raj against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/12372/FUL, dated 15 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a single storey side extension and loft conversion including second floor extension and change of use from multiple occupation to a single dwelling (with retail to remain as existing to the ground floor front of site)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site inspection I was unable to gain access to a neighbouring property to assess the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of its occupants. However, as the appeal does not succeed I am satisfied that the interested party will not be prejudiced by my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed extensions would be positioned to the rear of the appeal property which is clearly visible at the end of Chatham Road. At this position the surrounding area has a residential character from streets featuring dwellings with traditional design and appearance. Significantly, there is consistency in the ridged roof forms of the area which is continued in the gabled rear roof projections along Cambridge Road.
 5. In this context the increased height and flat roof of the proposed second floor extension would be a disruptive feature that would clearly be seen as a departure from the traditional roof forms of the area. Such an extension would appear overly bulky and be incongruous in its setting. It would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 6. That there is a similar extension at a neighbouring property does not reduce the harm I have identified as that property is positioned further away from
-

Chatham Road and is less prominent. Moreover, the existence of unsympathetic extensions, or the potential to carry out improvements using permitted development rights elsewhere, does not justify further inappropriate development.

7. Although there would be benefits provided by the additional accommodation proposed these would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified and resulting conflict with the design requirements of Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2012.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR