



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/21/3289988

36 Bowness Crescent, Kingston Vale, London SW15 3QL

- 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 Dr Andrew Tekle-Cadman against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/02183/HOU, dated 5 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. There is considerable variation, even within pairs of properties, in the street with several dwellings having been altered and extended. This includes the materials, roof shapes and rear projections.
4. The proposed roof would be set down from the highest point of the property and hipped roofs are not uncommon in the area. However, the flat roof extensions to the rear at roof and ground floor level have retained a clear view of openings in the floors above and below the additions. This gives a coherence to the rear elevation and roofscape.
5. The proposed hipped roof, that would adjoin the existing building midway up the window above, would unfavourably contrast with the existing rear elevation of the appeal building. I did not see any similar examples of this in the street. While the external materials would be matching, the hipped roof in relation to the window position above would give a disjointed appearance to the rear elevation.
6. Although there would be limited views of the extension from the street, this confused roof and window arrangement would be obvious from nearby properties and their gardens.
7. Therefore, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to accord with Policy D3 of the London Plan and Policy DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Core

Strategy. These, in part, seek to ensure that development responds to the context of a site and maintain and enhance local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

8. The separation distance and mature landscaping limits views to and from the site with the Kingston Hill Conservation Area, which has its significance, in part from, traditional properties and woodland setting. This along with the variation in the built form nearby means the scheme would not adversely affect the heritage asset or its setting.
9. Sufficient garden space would remain, and the extension would not increase the existing ground floor footprint. Even if I were to consider the scheme would not lead to unacceptable effects on the living conditions of occupants of nearby properties, a lack of harm is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the scheme.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development 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.
11. Therefore, for the reason given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR