
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2017

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/W/17/3181772

64 Chessington Hill Park, Chessington, KT9 2BL

- 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 Gary Faulkner against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 17/10137/FUL, dated 28 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing single storey flank extension and construction of a two and a half storey three bedroom dwelling with parking and associated works for residential use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development subject of this appeal has already been carried out and I was able to view it during my site visit. The appeal seeks planning permission retrospectively.
3. The appeal is accompanied by amended drawings which are said to reflect the development actually carried out on the site. The changes are relatively modest compared to the original proposal and the Council has had the opportunity to consider the amended drawings during the course of the appeal. As such, I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by me taking them into account and I have done so in determining the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The Council has already granted planning permission for a dwelling on the site and the principle of development is established. The main difference between the proposal granted permission and the appeal scheme is at roof level, where a gable end has been incorporated in place of a hipped roof and a large dormer window has been added to the rear roof slope.
6. The dwelling has been built on the end of an established terrace which has a hipped roof design, albeit that the appellant suggests a gable had recently been introduced to No 64. There is dispute between the parties as to whether this change had the benefit of planning permission but this is not a matter for the

appeal. The gable end that has been constructed is more akin to the roof design of properties in Angus Close which present a slightly different style and appearance, but the appeal property is located directly adjacent to these properties and provides a visual transition between the two styles. In this context, I do not find the gable feature to be in any way dominant or incongruous.

7. The rear dormer window is a box style appendage which spans almost the entire rear roof slope of the property, extending to the ridge of the building and close to the eaves and side boundaries. It is a substantial and visually dominating mass that fails to reflect the scale and proportions of the lower floors, appearing somewhat top heavy. Whilst the mass of the dormer is staggered at one end, this does little to reduce its visual impact from the public realm and a large extent of the bulky protrusion is readily visible from Angus Close given the angled orientation of the building.
8. I attach little weight to the similar dormer at No 64 as the status of the addition is unknown at present. In any case, it is not comparable to the impact of the appeal scheme given that it is not readily visible from the public realm owing to the screening provided by the appeal property. I also attach little weight to the appellant's position that a similar sized dormer could be constructed under permitted development rights. There is no suggestion that that is an option available here and in fact, the planning permission granted by the Council includes a condition removing permitted development rights for such extensions. This is not a feasible fallback position.
9. The development harms the character and appearance of the area. As such, it is in conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Core Strategy (2012), which require high quality design that respects the local context; the detailed design guidance for dormer windows contained within the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013); and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. In light of the above, and having considered all other matters, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR