

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/17/3174995

17 Meadow Hill, New Malden KT3 5RQ

- 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 F Dar against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 17/14186/HOU was refused by notice dated 11 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a double storey side extension, a ground floor rear extension, a loft conversion and a porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and Meadow Hill.

Reasons

3. Meadow Hill is a residential cul-de-sac lined by an interesting mix of semi-detached houses in an Art Deco style. Like many of the other houses here, No 17 has a single storey section to the side and a curved, full height central projecting bay which is shared with its neighbour, No 19.
 4. The main element of the proposal would be a part first floor/part 2 storey side extension that would be built up almost to the side boundary with a matching new curved bay at the front, projecting 0.9m forward of the main front wall. A similar, slightly smaller extension has recently been permitted (Ref 16/14231/HOU), the key difference being that the permitted extension would be set back about half a metre at the front and set down at ridge level, in line with advice in the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
 5. The Council's objection is to the proposed forward projection and to the lack of a set down at ridge level. I note that other houses in the street have been extended in a similar way to that proposed here, and that these fit in well with the street scene. In this case, however, No 15 next door is set well back in comparison to No 17 and has already been extended to the side at first floor level, up to the shared boundary. The proposed forward projection here would therefore become an awkward and prominent feature, standing out in
-

comparison to No 15 and butting up very close, with almost no gap at the side. In this particular situation, the proposed forward projection would appear as an overly uncompromising feature, representing cramped overdevelopment of the site.

6. I agree that the existing approval forms a fall-back position, but find that it would integrate better with the street scene. I conclude that the proposed side extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of Meadow Hill. It would therefore conflict with the aims of Core Strategy Policies CS8 and DM10 and the SPD, to ensure that developments incorporate the principles of good design and respect the most essential elements identified as contributing to the character and local distinctiveness of a street.
7. I recognise the appellant's reasonable wish to improve this family home. For the reasons set out above, however, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR