
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/W/17/3174235
23 The Roystons, Surbiton KT5 8HH

- 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 Landmark Ltd against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 16/16632/FUL, dated 6 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a new detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within a primarily residential area. It presently forms part of the gap between the rear of No 23 The Roystons and the side of No 47 The Byeways. The proposed detached dwelling would face onto and be accessed from The Byeways.
4. The area has clearly been subject to some change but largely retains a degree of spaciousness between the mainly large detached and semi-detached dwellings. The appellant has referred to the Berrylands character study which refers to this housing as being from the 1930's inter-war period. That was the prevailing sense of place that I experienced. This is a typical suburban area of that time. The dwellings have been laid out with modest front gardens in many cases allowing the retention of landscaping. Along The Byeways, a number of front garden hedges are retained and along with street trees, there is a typically suburban quality where such landscaping softens the street scene
5. I saw that there have been alterations to buildings which in some places have reduced the gaps between dwellings. There are also examples dotted around where infill dwellings have been constructed which go against the general prevailing character of the area. The appellant has referred to a number of these examples however, the presence of such dwellings has not overridden the character of the area. The examples at No 14 The Roystons, No 2 The Byeways and No 7A The Crest are clearly individual designs which differ

significantly from the dwellings next to them and generally in the wider area. It is not absolutely clear what the material circumstances were when those examples were approved. An aim of Policy CS8 of the current Core Strategy¹ (CS) is to protect the primarily suburban character of the borough and enhance where the character has been eroded.

6. The appeal site in my view plays a part in the more traditional character, appearance and the distinctiveness of the area. The large gap between the adjoining dwellings is very apparent even though the timber fences provide a hard edge to the site and the garden of No 23. The gap between dwellings contributes to the spacious character and allows views through of landscape features such as trees within adjoining gardens, softening the built environment. This contributes to the suburban character and appearance.
7. The proposed dwelling would sit further forward along the road than No 47 The Byeways. It would not follow adjoining front building lines but there would be the opportunity to create a small landscaped front garden behind the proposed wall which would be more reflective of the properties along The Byeways. However, the building in this forward position would reduce the spaciousness between the properties. The dwelling would have an individual form with a gable roof of the 2 storey element, appearing very different from the hipped ends of the nearest dwellings and the shallow depth of dwelling would contrast with those around it. The prominent gable on the single storey front projection would have some similarity to the front porches on dwellings in The Byeways. However the compact building and plot would look at odds in a prominent position, going against the typology of the houses and spaciousness of development generally nearby. The eaves height would be the same as No 23 as encouraged within the Council's residential Design Guide². However, the proposal would not respect the prevailing development typology and would not therefore adhere to the design principles as set out in that document.
8. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. This would not comply with CS Policies CS8 and DM10. This would not enhance the quality of this area and would therefore not comply with Policy 3.5 of the London Plan³. Furthermore, this would constitute a poor design, not complying with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. The benefit of an additional dwelling in an accessible suburban area would not outweigh the harm in relation to the main issue. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR

¹ Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames, Local Development Framework, Core Strategy, April 2012

² Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames, Local Development Framework, Residential Design Guide, July 2013

³ The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for London, consolidated with alterations since 2011, March 2016