

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

**by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 27 June 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/17/3173474**  
**50 Hemsby Road, Chessington KT9 2DZ**

- 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 Simon McTavish against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
  - The application Ref 16/10477/HOU, dated 12 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 January 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as 'demolish lean to and store, erect a two storey side and single storey rear extension'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, terrace and the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace house on the north western side of Hemsby Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential comprised of two storey terraced houses laid out in groups. The rhythm and symmetry of the terraces are emphasised by the regular pattern of front gable features, porches, chimneys and fenestration.
  4. The Council does not raise concerns regarding the proposed single storey rear extension and from everything which I have seen in submissions and on my site visit I have no reason to disagree.
  5. Policy Guidance 36 of the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2013 states that two storey and first floor side extensions should be designed to be in harmony with the appearance and character of the area. Amongst other things, extensions should remain subordinate to the main house; the roof of the extension should reflect and relate well to the main house and its roof form; and flat roofs should be avoided. Side extensions on semi-detached and end of terrace properties should also respect the symmetry of the adjoining semi-detached property; should not exceed 50% the width of the original house; and the roof should be set down from that of the original house by a minimum of 500mm; and the front elevation should be set-back at least 500mm from the front of the house.
-

6. The proposed side extension would be 1 metre from the boundary and would thus maintain sufficient separation from the neighbouring property. Nonetheless, the proposed side extension would be greater than 50% of the width of the original house. The roof ridge of the proposal would not be set down from the existing ridge by at least 500mm and the proposal would not be set back from the front of the house by 500mm. Indeed the proposed front gable would extend approximately 1.8m in front of the existing side elevation of the property. By virtue of the scale and design, the proposal would fail to appear subordinate to the host property and would also be in direct conflict with the SPD.
7. I note that the property on the other end of the terrace has been extended to the side and hence some symmetry has already been lost. However, this extension is set back from the front elevation and the roof ridge set down and it, therefore, appears subordinate to the host property. In any event, the design of the appeal proposal would fail to reflect the design of this extension and would not, therefore, appear symmetrical. Furthermore, the proposed flat roof to the front, in between the existing and proposed front gables would be contrary to the SPD, although I acknowledge that visibility of the roof would be limited. Taking these factors in combination, I consider that the proposal would be an incongruous addition which would harm the character and appearance of the host property, terrace and area.
8. Attention is drawn to a number of examples of two storey side extensions in the area. In the case of number 24 Hemsby Road, although there is no set back from the front, the side extension is set down from the ridge of the roof, is smaller than the main front gable feature and mirrors the extension on the other end of the terrace. The extensions at Nos 16, 40, 55 and 61 Hemsby Road are also smaller than the main front gable feature. Consequently, these extensions appear subservient to the host property.
9. The extension at 39 Hemsby Road appears to have been there for some time and, therefore, I cannot be sure that it was determined within the same development plan framework. No 73 Church Lane relates to a new house rather than an extension and the front facing gable mirrors the extension on the other end of the terrace. Consequently, none of these cases are directly comparable to the appeal proposal which limits the weight which I can attach to them in my Decision.
10. For the reasons stated, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property, the terrace and the area. It is, therefore, contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and Policies CS08 and DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 which collectively seek to secure high quality design which respects local character. Conflict also arises with the SPD.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons stated and taking all other considerations into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

*Caroline Mulloy*

Inspector