



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2021

**by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 02 November 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/21/3279584**  
**81 Fullers Avenue, Tolworth KT6 7TD**

- 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 Michael Hawthorne against the decision of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
  - The application Ref 21/00747/HOU, 10 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2021
  - The development proposed is the erection of hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions and installation of 2no. rooflights to front roofslope.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions and installation of 2no. rooflights to front roofslope at 81 Fullers Avenue, Tolworth KT6 7TD in accordance with the terms of the application, 21/00747/HOU, dated 10 March 2021, subject to the following conditions: -
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: 2100 - Proposed Site Plan, 2200- Proposed, Ground Floor, 2201 -Proposed First Floor, 2202 - Proposed Second Floor, 2203 - Proposed Roof Plan, 2210 -Proposed North Elevation, 2211- Proposed South Elevation and 2212 -Proposed West Elevation.
  - 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 description of development is taken from the decision notice and appeal form. In my view this more clearly and concisely describes the development and I have used it for my decision.

### Main Issue

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

## Reasons

4. Fullers Avenue and the surrounding streets consist of similar types of properties. No.81 is an end of terrace, the terrace comprises four properties and has a hipped roof form.
5. The proposed scheme includes a number of alterations to the roof, although the Council's concerns only relate to the proposed change from a hip to gable end. The proposed dormer window and roof lights are reflective of additions which have occurred in the area, and, as such, I have no reason to take a different view in relation to these elements.
6. The terrace block is located at a bend in the road and due to its juxtaposition, the whole roof form is only visible from directly opposite. Additionally, there is a splayed gap between No.81 and the neighbouring terrace, which has a slightly different orientation. In my view, whilst the gable would increase the bulk of the roof and remove the symmetry of the terrace, I do not find that it would be prominent or have a significant impact on the street scene. Visual separation would be retained and there are examples of similar changes to the roof profile in the vicinity; notably 16 and 27 and 71 Fullers Avenue and 18 Agar Close. As such, when observed in the wider context the gable roof form would not be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area.
7. Therefore, I find that the proposal would not be materially harmful to the character of the property or the surrounding area. It would comply with policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Local Development Framework Core Strategy which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development respects the suburban character of the area and incorporates good principles of design.

## Conclusion and Conditions

8. 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 and host property.
9. For the above reasons I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

*G Ellis*

INSPECTOR