



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2022

by James Blackwell LLB (Hons) PgDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/22/3302920

30 Pembroke Avenue, Kingston Upon Thames, Surbiton KT5 8HP

- 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 Kate Hennings against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/00684/HOU, dated 1 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear box dormer and alterations to roof with inset gable.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, located on the south-eastern side of Pembroke Avenue. The house has a half hipped roof, with a front two-storey gable. Whilst roof form is mixed along the road, rear box dormers are common, and contribute to the established character of the area.
4. Given their prevalence in and around the appeal property, a rear-roof box dormer could conceivably integrate effectively with the host property and the wider street scene. However, in this instance the box dormer would extend well beyond the hip of the existing roof structure. This means it would be seen as a bulky add-on to the property, rather than an extension which integrates seamlessly with the roof profile of the house. This incongruity would be readily visible from the front of the property, which means it would harm the appearance of the appeal property itself, as well as the wider street scene.
5. The development would therefore harm the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy (2012). Together, these policies require new development to respond positively to the character of an area, through high quality design which is appropriate in scale, appearance, shape and roof form. The development would also conflict with the design principles set out in the Residential Design SPD (2013). The SPD says box dormers should be inset from the sides and eaves of the roof by at least 500mm, and should complement the existing roof form of the property.

Conclusion

6. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR