

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2017

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/17/3177620

64 Motspur Park, New Malden, London, KT3 6PJ

- 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 Saad Hindosh against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 17/14177/HOU, dated 18 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of part single, part two storey rear and side extensions and creation of front driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. This part of Motspur Park is characterised by relatively large detached properties of a distinctive style. The houses are sited very close together in pairs being linked at ground floor level by a form of arch, so that when viewed from oblique angles along the road they exude the impression of being semi-detached.
 4. They display a unity of design, with features including prominent two storey bays topped with hipped roofs and steep catslide roofs to the side. The layout is distinctively suburban, but the inherently attractive original design of the dwellings means that far greater visual interest is conveyed locally than is the case in many examples of Metropolitan suburban development.
 5. As the appellant has pointed out, many of the houses in the area have been modified or extended, some, to my mind, in a more appropriate manner than others. Nevertheless, it seemed to me, that the locality as a whole has largely retained its originally designed visual integrity, portraying a residential area of good quality and visual distinctiveness.
 6. In this context, the appeal property stands prominently on a corner plot at the junction of Chilmark Gardens and Motspur Park. It has been extended or altered before; most notably, two reasonably designed dormers have been inserted in the slope of the catslide roof. However, despite the alterations, the original design remains distinctly perceptible.
-

7. The appellant's proposals would completely transform the appearance of the original dwelling, to its detriment. Although the extension would be slightly set back from the existing front wall the front elevation as a whole would be significantly elongated in two storey fashion. The two storey element would extend at the side of the house parallel to Chilmark Gardens, projecting well beyond the dwelling's existing main rear elevation. Only a barely recognisable remnant of the catslide roof would remain. A single storey feature would be built on the three main elevations.
8. The proposals, to my mind, represent wholly disproportionate, overly bulky and poorly designed additions to the dwelling, ruining its attractive shape and inherent design features and harmfully unbalancing its appearance. Since the development would occupy a prominent corner plot, this unacceptable design would be widely seen if it came to fruition, thus detracting significantly from the street scene.
9. The appellant's has pointed to other development in the area, either where large extensions have seemingly been allowed or to other larger developments such as the nursing home at the western extremity of Motspur Park. However, as I saw, these represent the exceptions rather than the rule, and most of the dwellings in this part of Motspur Park have largely retained their original scale and design integrity. The existence of other inappropriately scaled development does not justify granting permission for further harmful development such as proposed.
10. I conclude that the proposals would materially harm the character of the host property and the surrounding area, thus conflicting with the aims of policies CS8 & DM 10 of the Council's Core Strategy, requiring house extensions to be acceptably designed and the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area to be respected, maintained or enhanced when new development is proposed.

Other matters

11. All other matters referred to in the representations have been taken into account, including the views presented by local residents and the references made to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document entitled Residential Design and policy guidance 36, in particular. No other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR