
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2020

by Matthew Woodward BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/19/3242936

1A Princes Avenue, Tolworth KT6 7JJ

- 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 Mrs Razia Ghauri against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 19/01950/HOU, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion – with dormer extension towards existing alleyway, modification to entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling lies on a suburban street where various extensions to properties in the vicinity are apparent, including roof extensions and alterations. It is situated towards the end of the street and close to an alleyway. The alleyway marks the dividing line between the prevailing residential character of Princes Avenue, and the more irregular arrangement of built form which occupies the spaces to the rear of properties on Ewell Road, generally facing the alleyway. Unlike most of the other properties on the street which are semi-detached, the appeal dwelling lies at the end of a short terrace comprising three dwellings, which reinforces the variety of built form in the vicinity of the appeal site.
4. I was able to see on my site visit several prominent examples in the street where one of the dwellings within a semi-detached pair had been altered to a gable end roof design. In this regard, the proposed gable type roof extension would not appear out of kilter with the prevailing roofscape, nor would it appear incongruous in the street. The proposed increase in the roof height would ensure that the ridge height of the entire terrace would be consistent and would be in keeping with the design and appearance of roofs locally.
5. However, in respect of the side dormer proposed on the roof slope of the rear projecting element, this would have a limited set back from the eaves, and its ridge would be very close to that of the main roof. Even though other rear

dormers are visible in various places along Princes Avenue, and dormers are a characteristic of the rear facing roof slopes of those properties on Ewell Road which face the alleyway; visually the proposed side dormer would dominate this particular part of the roof and, on account of its height and depth, it would have an overtly bulky appearance in the street which its design would not overcome. It would fail to complement the character of the wider area, contrary to the guidance set out in the SPD¹.

6. Whilst I appreciate that the proposed gable roof alteration would substantially reduce the visibility of the proposed dormer from the street when viewed in front of the appeal property, the dormer would nevertheless be particularly apparent when viewed from the stretch of street which runs between the alleyway and the junction of Princes Avenue and Ewell Road. From here, the dormer would appear as an incongruous addition to the roofscape drawing the eye and resulting in visual harm to the street scene.
7. Consequently, the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2012 which seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that householder developments uphold the principles of good design and recognise distinctive local features and character. The proposal would also conflict with the Local Development Framework Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document amended November 2013 which requires that dormers complement the character of the wider area. Moreover, the proposal would not be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, contrary to paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

8. The proposal would make efficient use of land and buildings in accordance with the overarching aims of the Framework and would increase the appeal property's internal living space and provide improved living conditions, which would apparently be in line with Policy 3.4 of the London Plan 2016. However, in connection with an enlarged single dwelling, these benefits attract only limited weight, insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. Like the Council, I have no objection to the amendments proposed to the entrance porch due to their limited visual impact. However, this does not detract from the harm I have identified in respect of the proposed dormer.

Conclusion

10. I therefore conclude that, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Matthew Woodward

INSPECTOR

¹ Policy Guidance 39 of the Local Development Framework Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document amended November 2013