



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2020

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/W/20/3253073

29 Dudley Road, Kingston Upon Thames KT1 2UN

- 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 Jonathon Wilson against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 20/00299/FUL, dated 6 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of a side dormer (setback approx. 4500mm from the front of the existing building) to the existing roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated on the east side of Dudley Road, a predominantly residential area. This part of the road is characterised by gable fronted traditional properties arranged in pairs on both sides of the road.
4. The strong rhythm of the road is emphasised by the houses set on a consistent building line behind short front gardens with low walls and the regular pattern of canted bays and vertical windows, decorative features, gable peaks and chimneys. The roofs on this part of the road remain largely unaltered with the exception of roof lights. The uniformity of the layout, traditional architectural features and the strong symmetry between the pairs of dwellings make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. It is proposed to erect a side dormer to the roof in order to facilitate a loft conversion. The dormer would be set down from the ridgeline of the roof, set back around 4.5m from the front elevation and would be constructed in traditional materials. Due to the set-back, the dormer would not be visible from the north; however, it would extend above the existing roof plane and would be readily visible when walking past the property and, as illustrated at paragraph 6.8 of the appellant's submissions, in views from Mill Place.
6. The dormer would be a substantial size extending a significant proportion of the existing roof plane. Furthermore, it would unbalance the characteristic symmetry between the pairs of semi-detached properties and disrupt the visual

uniformity of the roofscape on this part of the road. Consequently, the proposal would introduce an incongruous feature to the host property which would harm the character and appearance of the area.

7. Attention is drawn to the presence of side dormers at Mill Place and roof extensions at 11-13 Dudley Road. However, Mill Place is a comparatively modern development which has a different character to Dudley Road and the appellant indicates that those dormers were constructed under permitted development rights. Furthermore, whilst dormer windows exist at Mill Place; Dudley Road is currently free from such intrusion.
8. Whilst there are roof extensions at numbers 11-13 Dudley Road, the properties represent a different architectural style to the appeal property and pairs of semi-detached, gable fronted properties which comprise the predominant character of Dudley Road. Attention is also drawn to properties on Villiers Road and Dawson Road which have side dormers. However, no details are provided of any of the above cases and I cannot, therefore, be certain that they are directly comparable to the appeal proposal which limits the weight which I can attach to them in my decision.
9. Attention is drawn to planning permission granted in 2018 for side dormer extensions at No 2 Dudley Road; however, the side dormers proposed are of a significantly different design to the appeal proposal. Furthermore, whilst I acknowledge the presence of the permission; it has not been implemented more than two years after being granted and I note that planning permission would expire March 2021. I cannot, therefore, be certain that it would be implemented, and the proposed dormers are not yet a feature of the street scene. In any event, each case must be determined on its own merits and the presence of the planning permission does not justify the harm which I have identified.
10. For the reasons stated, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 which together require new development to recognise distinctive local features and character and incorporate principles of good design. Furthermore, conflict arises with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and history.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would have some benefits for the occupiers in terms of the provision of additional living space; however, this would not outweigh the harm which I have identified or the conflict with the development plan.
12. For the reasons stated and taking all other considerations into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector