The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7th July 2022

by Megan Thomas Q.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 22ND July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/22/3293746
178 Park Road, Kingston upon Thames KT2 5LP

- 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 Sam and Rosy Huddart against the decision of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
- The application Ref. 20/03070/HOU, dated 20 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 December 2021.
- The development proposed is the "conversion and extension to roof space to form further accommodation on second floor".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the streetscene and the Kingston Hill/Coombe Hill Area of Strategic Area of Special Character.

Reasons

3. The site comprises a detached dwelling which is located on the eastern side of Park Road. The site is located within the Kingston Hill/Coombe Hill Strategic Area of Special Character which is a non-designated heritage asset. A tree on the front boundary is subject to a Tree Preservation Order. Park Road is a predominantly residential road which is a bus route and has a variety of housing styles along it but there is a predominance of semi-detached dwellings. The closest neighbour to the north is a three storey building in flats.

4. The dwelling has a front and rear garden with some off-road parking at the front. It has a two storey extension on its southern side which has a flat roof and a two storey original element with a pitched roof.

5. It is proposed to extend part of the roof to create new accommodation in the roofspace. The two storey flat-roofed extension would become 2.5 storeys with a pitched roof. At the rear there would be a middle gable-shaped window with Juliette balcony and two other windows, and pre-patinated green copper vertical tiles. It would have a partly flat roof. There would be additional

accommodation in the form of a work-from-home office and a master bedroom and ensuite. The completed dwelling would be predominantly 2.5 storeys.

6. Whilst there would be some benefit to the appearance of the existing house in losing the flat roof on the two storey extension, the resulting development would appear incongruous and contrived. The proposed rear roof would be higher than the roof ridge on the main original part of the house and would rise up to a flat roof area behind the original part of the house, resulting in poor roof design. The 2.5 storey element would, amongst other things, dominate the front elevation and appear bulky, out-of-proportion and unsympathetic to both the host dwelling and the streetscene. From the rear, the new half storey and roof would be unarticulated and would appear artificially inserted onto the dwelling thus failing to blend with the existing design. The resulting southern elevation would also be high, stark and somewhat domineering in the streetscene.

7. The appeal site falls within the Kingston Hill/Coombe Hill Strategic Area of Special Character (SASC) which in this part of the Borough is notable for its set back houses in well-spaced plots with largely intact front boundaries, planted front gardens and pleasant suburban appearance. Whilst I consider that the resulting development would not be sympathetic to the streetscene, it would have no elements which I judge would harm the significance of the SASC as a non-designated heritage asset. Spacing and plot size and a suburban feel would endure.

8. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and immediate streetscene. It would be contrary to policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and policies CS8 and DM10 of the Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy (adopted 2012).

Conclusion

9. Having taken into account all representations made including those relating to the variety of house styles in the area, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas Q.C.

INSPECTOR