

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2021

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/21/3276222

71 Sanger Avenue, Chessington KT9 1BY

- 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 Ms Jenny Coll against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application, Ref. 21/00572/HOU, dated 10 March 2021 was refused by notice dated 30 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension & erection of a dormer roof extension (with Juliet balcony) and installation of 3 front roof lights to facilitate the loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions for the occupants of Nos. 69 & 73 as regards outlook.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is one of two mid-terrace properties in a block of four. As such, its potential for further development is significantly constrained if it is not to have an unacceptable effect on its surroundings and neighbours.
 4. Turning firstly to the proposed dormer, the submitted drawing ref. SAN/2021/02 shows the extension as being set slightly down from the ridge but only a minimal distance from the sides of the dwelling and effectively sitting on the eaves line.
 5. I consider this scale to be excessive for the property and unsympathetic to the dwelling itself, the terrace block and the wider surroundings. Although to the rear, the dormer would still be seen in views from the back gardens of other houses in the terrace. The appellant has submitted plans and a photograph of an existing dormer at No. 79, but the plans show it as being noticeably set in from the sides and set up from the eaves line, neither of which apply to the appeal proposal.
 6. As regards the proposed rear extension, this would envelop the existing store building that is an original part of the property and terminate at a short distance
-

from the front of the brick built dog grooming outbuilding. To all intents and purposes these would be read together as an addition of considerable depth out of keeping with the terrace. Furthermore, I agree with the Council's view that the cumulative visual impact of these buildings would have an unacceptably adverse effect on the outlook from the rear windows and gardens of Nos. 69 and 73.

7. Overall, I conclude that as the appeal proposals would harm the character and appearance of the locality and the outlook for the neighbours to both sides it would conflict with the Council's policies. These are Policy DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy 2012 and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021. In addition there would be contravention of Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.
8. For these reasons I dismiss the appeal.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR