



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2019

by Jamie Reed DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/19/3233391

133 Hook Rise South, Chessington KT6 7NA

- 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 & Mrs Hammond against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/01136/HOU, dated 25 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a part two storey side extension with front entrance porch and canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension with front entrance porch and canopy at 133, Hook Rise South, Chessington KT6 7NA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01136/HOU, dated, 25 April 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location and Block Plan 0601/S/01 Rev A; Existing Plans And Elevations 0601/S/02; Proposed Ground Floor 0601/P/01 Rev A; Proposed First Floor Plan 0601/P/02 Rev A; Proposed Roof Plan 0601/P/03 Rev A; Proposed Front and Rear Elevations 0601/P/04 Rev A; and Proposed Side Access Elevation 0601/P/05 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached property situated on a road of similar properties in a predominantly residential area. It is noted that the appeal property and its neighbour which forms the other half of the pair of semi-detached houses, No 131 Hook Rise South, are relatively untouched, in

terms of additions/extensions when compared to others nearby. A significant number of these other dwellings have extended into the driveway space to their sides in differing ways, resulting in a somewhat varied and fragmented streetscape along this length of the road.

4. An unusual characteristic of Hook Rise South is that it only features a footpath and dwellings along one of its sides. These dwellings look across the carriageway of Hook Rise South directly onto the heavily trafficked A3/Kingston Bypass/Hook Underpass. This busy dual carriageway runs parallel to Hook Rise South and is a major route in and out of London. Consequently, it is difficult to achieve any collective views of the dwellings in this location, due to the dominance of these highway arrangements and the limited footpaths. As a result, few of the dwellings in this area, including the appeal property, are of any particular prominence within the street scene. Consequently, the relatively untouched appearance of the appeal property and its neighbour, No 131 Hook Rise South, are not of any great significance in this particular location.
5. The proposal seeks to build a flush 2 storey extension to the side of the appeal property, which would extend towards its neighbour on the other side, namely No 135 Hook Rise South. This other property also features a 2 storey extension that is built flush with the front of its host. However, this extends right up to the boundary that the two properties share with one another, whereas the proposal would stop short. In doing so, the two properties would not become conjoined and sufficient width would be left to prevent them from appearing as a terrace. The extension would also feature a hipped roof with a significantly lower ridge line than that of the main roof of the appeal property. Such design features would result in a subordinate form of development that would not dominate its host. In addition, the proposed arrangement would also enable occupiers to continue to move bins, cycles and other items to and from their garden to the rear, as they do now.
6. The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Council Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2013) provides recommendations and guidance in respect of proposals of this nature. Whilst the proposal would not be set in from the shared boundary by the distance specified in this document and would not be set back from the front elevation as recommended, it would nonetheless still result in a form of development that would appear subordinate to its host, primarily due to its reduced roof height. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposal does not strictly adhere to the SPD, I am mindful that this is only guidance and due to the varied and fragmented streetscape along this length of the Hook Rise South, I find that the proposal would not be uncharacteristic within the streetscene and would not result in any significant visual harm.
7. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would relate well to its host and would be in harmony with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal does not conflict with Policies CS8 or DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Local Development Framework (2012). When read together, these policies seek to ensure that proposals are of a high quality design that relates well to the character and local distinctiveness of its surroundings.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also included a condition requiring that the materials used match the appeal property, in order to ensure that the development is in-keeping with the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions.

Jamie Reed

INSPECTOR