
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

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

Decision date: 15th November 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/17/3179407
55 Grove Road, Surbiton KT6 4BY

- 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 Partrick Manwell against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 17/12202/HOU, dated 23 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion including new dormers to provide a bedroom and bathroom and create a balcony overlooking the public highway. Ground floor alterations including conversion of integral garage into living space and conversion of part of existing conservatory into utility area. Addition of gate to external street boundary. Removal of chimney stack.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a semi-detached, bay fronted dwelling located on a residential street that has a mixture of house types of various design styles, heights, and construction ages. Although the street does not display any predominant design style, very few of the properties on the street have front dormers.
4. The appeal site lies on the opposite side of the road to the Cadogan Road Conservation Area. I agree with the Council that the appeal property is located a sufficient distance from the Conservation Area boundary to ensure that the proposed development would not affect its setting.
5. The Council has drawn my attention to the adopted guidance contained within Policy Guidance 39 (Dormer Windows) of the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD). The SPD advises that dormers should be designed so that they are set down from the ridge line of the existing roof by at least 500mm; are set in from the sides and eaves of the roof by at least 500mm and are designed to complement the character of the

- existing house and wider area. In addition the SPD discourages the provision of dormers to the front slope of the roof.
6. In a proposed position between the two projecting front gables of the roof slope, the proposed front dormer would appear prominent in the street scene. It would include the provision of a balcony with balustrade that would project beyond the front elevation of the property. Although it would be set down from the ridge by 500mm and set in from the sides of by 500mm, it would not be set up from the eaves. The proposed design would therefore not meet the requirements of the SPD.
 7. In my view, the proposed front dormer would appear as an incongruous addition to the roof slope that would unacceptably unbalance the symmetry of the roof scape of the pair of semi-detached properties. It would appear as an unsympathetic, prominent addition that would have little design relationship with the architectural character of the host property. Given the extent of unaltered front roof slopes in the area and in being like no other front dormer on the street, it would cause the roof scape to be at odds with that of the prevailing character of the street. As such, the proposed front dormer would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of host property and the surrounding area.
 8. The proposed rear dormer, in not being set down from the ridge by 500mm and not set up from the eaves by 500mm, would also fail to meet the requirements of the SPD. Views of the rear roof of the appeal property are limited to those from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties and from the garage court to the rear. However, in such views the proposed rear dormer would appear as an unacceptably bulky addition that, owing to its size, would appear as a dominant structure on the roof.
 9. Although the properties in the immediate vicinity have boundary walls with fencing and hedging, the majority on this side of the street do not have access gates and as such the street has a generally open character. The appellant has drawn my attention to the fact that the Council has recently granted planning permission for a sliding gate on the front boundary (Ref 17/12505) although I have no details of the design of the gate or the planning considerations that were relevant to this being considered acceptable.
 10. I do not consider that a front gate to the property would be necessarily unacceptable. However, in this case the design of the gate proposed, due to its height and extent of panelling behind the metal railed elements, would result in the appeal property having a degree of enclosure that would be out of character with the open nature of other property entrances on this side of the street.
 11. The Council has drawn my attention to Policy Guidance 44 of the SPD which advises that enclosures should not appear out of character with the street in general. Although the property at No 40 on the opposite side of the street has a solid pedestrian gate, the predominant character of the area is that of generally open access driveways. In my view, the design of the gate proposed would erode this character.
 12. Against that background, I therefore conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies CS 8 and DM 10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon

Thames Local Development Framework - Core Strategy (2012). These policies, amongst other things, require new development to be of a good design that relates well to its surroundings and complements the local character and distinctiveness of the street scene or area.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR