

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2021

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/21/3279323

30 Chesfield Road, Kingston Upon Thames KT2 5TH

- 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 & Mrs Allen against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/00015/HOU, dated 5 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer extension and installation of two front roof-lights to facilitate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a residential road of similar property types and some semi-detached dwellings.
 4. Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 requires development to enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness. Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy (2012) expect development proposals to incorporate principles of good design and respect the character and appearance of the original building and the prevailing character of the surrounding area.
 5. The Council's *Residential Design SPD* includes a policy concerning 'piggyback' extensions, which states that where the character of the property and wider street scene allows there may be scope to construct a 'piggyback' extension subject to a number of criteria, including that the house is on a narrow plot and the side elevations are not highly visible from the street scene.
 6. Many of the dwellings in Chesfield Road have been extended, including with 'piggyback' type extensions with a set back from the original frontage and full roof extension running to the rear. However, as the predominant original roof
-

form in the street is pitched roofs most of the visible examples have pitched roof extensions that respect the original roof profile. Moreover, most dwellings are positioned sufficiently close to neighbouring properties such that the side elevation of the extension cannot readily be seen from the street, in accordance with the SPD. There are some limited examples of properties with roof extensions that are not set back from the frontage, but these retain a pitched roof form.

7. In contrast to these established extensions, the appeal proposal involves a flat roofed dormer type extension with a similar set back from the front and also running the full length of the property. Unlike other properties in the road, No 30 has a single storey garage located between it and No 32, resulting in a materially larger gap than is common between properties. As a result, the side elevation of the appeal property is highly visible within the street scene. Therefore, unlike other extensions, the full extent and profile of the extended roof would be visible from the public realm, contrary to the SPD guidance. From these views the uncharacteristic flat roof form extending along the property's full length, together with the additional bulk of the extended side elevation, would appear as an incongruous and alien feature that would not respect the original built form of the host dwelling or the predominant roof form within the street scene of Chesfield Road.
8. While No 28 has a form of flat roofed extension, this is not as visible or prominent as the side elevation of the proposed extension to No 30 would be, nor is it quite as deep. Other properties referred to by the appellants, such as No 6, have rear dormers that are not of the same extent as the appeal proposal would be. Properties on Burton Road and Canbury Avenue that have flat-roofed extensions do not form part of the street scene of Chesfield Road and, in any case, these examples do not in my view represent good design that complies with the SPD.
9. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extensions would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, they are contrary to Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 and to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Core Strategy, as described above.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the representations made by interested parties. These raise matters already addressed under the main issue and also the effect of the extensions on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, while the upward extent of the property would be increased, its overall depth would remain the same. Consequently, there would be no material harm resulting from the effect on natural light or overlooking. There is no basis to suggest that a residential extension of this type would lead to increased noise and disturbance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson INSPECTOR