



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2017

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/W/17/3180858

First floor flat, 246 Kingston Road, New Malden, KT3 3RN

- 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 P Onslow-Cole against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 17/14061/FUL, dated 16 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a roof conversion with dormers to side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof conversion with dormers to side and rear at First floor flat, 246 Kingston Road, New Malden, KT3 3RN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/14061/FUL, dated 16 January 2017, 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: Block Plan; 16327/03 rev. B; 16327/04 rev. B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates an end-of-terrace building and a forecourt laid to hardstand. The terrace is two storeys along its substantial length, with retail and commercial uses occupying ground floor units, and predominantly residential above, with a regular, repeated pattern of front gables arranged along the pitched roof. The site has a similar layout to others in the terrace, and this appeal concerns the upper floor flat, which has a separate entrance leading from the ground floor.
4. The proposed development incorporates the occupation of the space within the roof with a bedroom and ensuite bathroom, and includes a side-facing dormer

extension that would continue the existing roof ridge at its present height, along the length of the dormer. This dormer's largest window would face towards the side roof hip of 248 Kingston Road, with only a narrow space separating these two elements. The Council has not objected to the design of the proposed rear-facing dormer extension, and thus my consideration is limited to the side dormer.

5. The Council's adopted *Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) (2013) provides guidance on the design of domestic extensions. It suggests that roof dormers should be set down from the main ridge of the roof, to assist such extensions from appearing overlarge. However, in this instance, the proximity of the facing roof at No. 248 limits the visibility of the proposed dormer's location to narrow corridors from the front and rear of the site, which would minimise its visual impact and prevent it from appearing obtrusive within the street scene. Apart from the roof ridge, it would be set in from the eaves level, which would preserve the secondary nature of its appearance.
6. Given the length of the terrace and its dominance in this part of the street scene, the dormer would not detract from this primacy. This length also prevents any comparison of symmetry between the proposed dormer's location and the other end of the terrace. Furthermore, given the difference in the pitch and height of the roof at No. 248, it is sufficiently different in appearance to the appeal property, that the extension would not appear incongruous in comparison.
7. Together, these factors would limit the visual impact of the extension and preserve the dominant profile of the main building. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with the Council's *Core Strategy* (2012) Policies CS 8 and DM 10, which require development to incorporate good design that respects local character and distinctiveness, amongst other considerations. These aims are consistent with the strategic design policies of *The London Plan* (2016).

Conclusion and Conditions

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
9. The Council declined to provide suggested conditions. Given the absence of harm arising from the proposal, it is only necessary to apply three conditions. As well as the standard time condition, I have included condition 2 to provide certainty. Although appeal plan 16327/04 rev. B specifies that the proposed materials would match those existing on the building, I have also applied condition 3 to add certainty, and to preserve the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR