
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/17/3173305
44 Kings Drive, Surbiton KT5 8NQ

- 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 Chris Burn against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/16868/HOU, dated 6 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension at 44 Kings Drive, Surbiton KT5 8NQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/16868/HOU, dated 6 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 349-P-10-A, 349-P-15-A, 349-P-30-A, 349-P-31-A, 349-P-40-A and 349-P-41-A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached residential property situated in a predominantly residential area. It forms an attractive well-balanced pair of properties with No 42 as both properties are relatively unaltered. There are also some detached residential properties in the area. Owing to its location in a long row of houses and the fairly regular set back from the street frontage the appeal site is not particularly prominent within the street scene. A garage to the side of the existing property creates a gap at first floor level between the host property and No 46.

4. At my site visit I observed that many properties in the locality have been altered and extended, including large roof extensions and side extensions, some of which appear to be very similar to the current proposal before me. I also saw that, as a consequence of the alterations that have taken place over the years, there are different sized gaps between properties. This non-uniformity and the different roof forms are very much part of the current character of the attractive residential area.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would extend along existing roof line and form a relatively large roof form, different to the current scale and massing of roof. Although the roof form would change significantly I do not consider that the alteration would be uncharacteristic of the area and, although substantial, would not necessarily harm the integrity of the host property or the area, generally. It would not appear incongruous or at odds with its residential setting, but would blend into the altered street scene. Neither do I consider that the additional bulk, scale and massing of the property would dominate the street scene or detract from what is currently an attractive residential frontage.
6. The host property would be separated from the boundary with No 46 by approximately 0.78 metres which is significantly less than at present at first floor and roof levels. However, given the variation in the gaps between properties along the street and in the wider residential area, a smaller gap would not be uncharacteristic or harmful to the appearance of the area.
7. The proposal would unbalance the symmetric roofscape created by the host property and No 42; however, due to there being little conformity in the area and variety in the relationships between individual and pairs of properties in the vicinity of the site I do not consider that this effect would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The large side extension would create a much larger frontage to the property, but in a way that respects the overall integrity of the property by retaining key features such as the double height front pitched roof bay, for example, and by keeping a relatively simple overall form of building. Materials would match existing.
9. Therefore, although the extension would be substantial and alter the scale of the property I do not consider that it would be overly dominant or be an incongruous feature in the street scene. As such it would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and it would comply with Policies CS 8 and DM 10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy Adopted April 2012 and the Residential Design SPD Adopted July 2013 (Amended November 2013) which, among other matters, seek to protect the primarily suburban character of the Borough, ensure that new development relates well to its surroundings and incorporates principles of good design.

Conditions

10. I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition specifying matching materials.

Conclusion

11. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be allowed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR