The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2022

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/22/3292669
10 Purbeck Avenue, New Malden KT3 6RW

- 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 Naveed Shah against the decision of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
- The application Ref 21/03235/HOU, dated 8 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2022.
- The development proposed is for a larger single story rear extension with flat roof and parapet walls plus single story side extension adjoining part existing rear extension with mono-pitched roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey dwelling set within a reasonably sized plot that has both front and rear gardens. The area is characterised by comparably sized properties with similar layouts. The position of these buildings being set back from their site frontages, together with the width of the road and grass verges, gives the area a spacious character to which the appeal property positively contributes.

4. Although there appears to have been a consistency in the original design of houses in the vicinity, alterations and changes have occurred. In a number of cases, the catslide roof and side dormers appear to have been assimilated into the main body of the dwelling, with roof shapes changing and properties being extended as a result. As such, there is now a degree of variation between houses but in general the resulting dwellings do not harm the overall character of the area.

5. The proposed side extension would sit flush with the front of the dwelling and extend the full length of the main part of the house. This will result in the loss of the lower part of the catslide roof and small front bay window. This, together with the design of the proposed roof and its proximity to the lower parts of both side dormers, results in a somewhat awkward appearance that would be harmful to the overall design and appearance of the host building.

6. This harm to the dwelling would be appreciated in the street scene, with the works appearing out of character and in contrast to the general level of integration other, extended properties have achieved.

7. The single storey extension would wrap around the rear of the dwelling, connecting into the midpoint of a pitched roof to an existing single storey rear projection. A further flat roof extension to the rear of the dwelling is also proposed. Due to its design and parapet wall, this introduces a third roof form and height onto the rear of the host property. The varying heights and roof forms would compete with one another visually and the resulting appearance would be harmfully out of character with the composed design of the existing building, despite the use of matching materials.

8. I recognise that retaining the existing rear projection makes an integrated design solution difficult to achieve and that neighbouring dwellings appear to have large rear extensions, some of which involve two roof forms. However, the proposal as a whole would not integrate with, or appear sympathetic to, the building's overall design. I therefore find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing house and to the wider area.

9. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy (2012) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure developments respond positively to their context and the character of the area and also respect the features and appearance of existing buildings.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR