
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 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: 20 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/17/3174216

37 Knightwood Crescent, New Malden KT3 5JR

- 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 A Saboohi against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/14952/HOU, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a part first floor / part two storey side / rear extension and single storey side / rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Procedural matter

3. I have used the description of development above rather than the description used on the application form as it better describes the proposal before me.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two storey semi-detached house situated in a predominantly residential area. The area has mainly similar type properties with differing sized front and rear garden areas. At my site visit I observed that many properties locally have been altered and extended, including large side facing dormers and two storey side extensions. Nonetheless, many of the pairs of semi-detached pairs of properties retain some degree of balance and symmetry. The pairs of properties are regularly spaced and are set behind front gardens within a tree lined street scene which provides an attractive and cohesive high quality residential environment.
5. I also observed at my visit that the appeal property has been altered and extended considerably. The current proposal seeks to reduce the overall scale of the alterations undertaken to date, including reducing the ridge height of the extended roof.
6. I note from the plans submitted that before the appeal property was extended its overall scale and massing was similar to that of its adjoining property No 39, although No 39 does have a side-facing dormer extension.

7. The proposal would very significantly increase the overall bulk, scale and massing of the building, providing a very different form to that of No 39. The stepped ridge line, awkward roof form, significantly increased footprint and high two storey side extension would result in a complex extension which would not be subordinate to the original structure. The pair of properties would be unbalanced to an unacceptable degree, resulting in an incongruous development that would be very much at odds with its surroundings.
8. There are some mature trees in the immediate vicinity of the property; however, given the siting of the property at the end of a row, the significant additional mass of building would be seen from nearby rear gardens of other residential properties, including Nos 33 and 35 Knightwood Crescent.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to other nearby residential extensions. However, many of the examples serve to illustrate the harm that can result from large, prominent and poorly designed developments. Furthermore, I do not have the full details of the circumstances in which many of those extensions were approved. In any case, the other examples are not a good reason for allowing a harmful development elsewhere and I have determined the current proposal on its own merits. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the previous planning appeal for this site.¹ My decision is consistent with that decision with respect to the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area as a consequence of the scale of the extension.
10. It appears to me that the appellant is frustrated in the manner the current application has been dealt with in the light of pre-application advice provided by Council representatives. However, I am required to determine the proposal before me in the light of the development plan and other material considerations rather than on the Council's procedural matters.
11. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies CS 8 and DM 10 of the Core Strategy Adopted April 2012 and guidance in the Residential Design SPD Adopted July 2013 (Amended November 2013). Among other matters these seek to protect the suburban character of the Borough and new development should incorporate the principles of good design and relate well to the surroundings. Residential extensions should be of a high quality design and large scale extensions which dominate the appearance of the original building are likely to be inappropriate.

Conclusion

12. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/Z5630/D/15/3130665