
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2021

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 JULY 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/21/3272664

39 Mayfair Avenue, Worcester Park KT4 7SH

- 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 D Vantomme against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston-upon-Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/00085/HOU, dated 13 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey rear extension and two storey side extension at 39 Mayfair Avenue, Worcester Park KT4 7SH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00085/HOU, dated 13 January 2021, subject to the following conditions;
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2097-11 Site Location Plan and Proposed Block Plan; 2097-1 Existing Floor Plans; 2097-2 Existing Roof Plan; 2097-3 Existing Elevations; 2097-7 Proposed Floor Plans; 2097-8 Proposed Elevations.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. As the revisions are not determinative in relation to this appeal it was not necessary to revert to the parties.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Mayfair Avenue is characterised by a variety of detached and semi-detached dwellings which over a period of time have been altered in a number of moderate ways. As such the detail of dwellings alters, albeit in a subtle way, along the length of the road, with there being a degree of symmetry retained for semi-detached dwellings.
5. The dwellings are well spaced, and the space to the side of the host property would comfortably facilitate the two-storey extension. Whilst the proposal would inevitably be built closer to the boundary with No 41, there would remain a gap between the properties. The appeal property is a semidetached dwelling and is experienced in the setting of its pairing with No 37. Similarly, No 41 is attached to, and experienced with, No 43. As such I do not consider that the extension would result in a terrace effect.
6. The ground floor element would incorporate a garage which would be set very slightly forward of the front entrance, this would mimic the bay style window at ground and first floor level and would create an element of symmetry to the front façade. The first floor would be set back with detailing to match the existing dwelling.
7. The roof would feature a gable roof, which would remove the symmetry with No 37 which has a hipped roof. Having regard to the various alterations that have occurred along the length of the road, I find that the roof lines do not exhibit a profound sense of uniformity. As such when observed in the overall context the gable roof would not be harmful to the wider street scene.
8. I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character of the dwelling or the wider area. It would comply with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Local Plan 2012 and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development respects the suburban character of the area and incorporates good principles of design.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the extension would bring the built form closer to the side elevation of No 41, the evidence identifies that the windows on that elevation serve non-habitable rooms and therefore the proposal would not be harmful to living conditions of those occupying No 41. The rear extension would be subordinate at single storey and would therefore not be harmful to living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion and Conditions

10. I have found that the proposal would comply with the development plan when taken as a whole and therefore the appeal should succeed. I have specified the plans for certainty, and included a condition relating to materials to ensure that the proposal reflects the character of the area in its design.
11. For the reasons above I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR