



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2022

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/21/3289944

42 Manor Way, Worcester Park KT4 7PH

- 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 Li Songez against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/01916/HOU, dated 21 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is double storey side extension and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the application form. Although different to that given on the decision notice, no confirmation has been provided that a change was agreed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. There is variation in the scale and appearance of properties in the street. There are 2 distinct styles of property, pairs with front elevation catslide roofs and pairs with only 2 storey bay windows. These are strong architectural features that are an important character of the street. Even though several properties have been extended and altered, including at roof level, while only set back a small distance on occasions such as at 12 Manor Way, in most cases the catslide feature remains at both properties in a pair.
5. At present the roofscape of the appeal dwelling is not a replica of the attached one. Nonetheless, the general proportions of the properties are similar and the catslide feature is prominent on both. This currently contributes positively to the pleasant streetscene that the relative consistency and prominence of catslide roofs within individual pairs gives.
6. The proposed side extension would be set back at first floor level in part. Notwithstanding this, alterations to the roof would result in the catslide feature being lost with no set back or set down as required in the SPD. The original features of the property would be overwhelmed, and the scheme would give a

disjointed and unbalanced appearance to the pair. While it is suggested lower eaves could be maintained as a decorative feature, the plans before the Council and me do not show this.

7. The 2-storey side extension would not be set back at ground floor level and in combination with the roof alterations would add considerable bulk to the property. The width and mass of the front elevation would appear disproportionate to the other property in the pair.
8. The extension would be partly screened from the street given the position of the property at the end of the road and nearby vegetation. Nevertheless, there would be many views along the street and from other properties where the front elevation of this pair of properties would be seen together. The first-floor alterations and bulk of the extensions at that level would still be seen over and around boundary features.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy and Policy D4 of the London Plan. These, in part seek to ensure that proposals relate well to, maintain and respect their surroundings and local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

10. I saw that 34 Manor Way has had a similar extension losing the catslide roof. However, in that instance the catslide roof at the attached property was largely screened by tall vegetation. In any event, where the contrast between the roofscape of the pair was visible it served to show the unfavourable effects of such an imbalance within a pair. Other examples my attention has been drawn to¹ were not located in the same street and would not be seen with the appeal property.
11. A lack of opposition to a scheme from nearby residents is not a reason in itself to allow a proposal. The conduct of the Council during the application process is not a matter that alters my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
13. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR

¹ Malden Road ad Hollington Road