



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2022

by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/22/3301277

67 Howard Road, Kingston Upon Thames, New Malden KT3 4EB

- 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 Samson Chan against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/00501/HOU, dated 17 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as '5m ground floor flat roof extension with 3m 1st floor flat roof extension over with Loft conversion over. Enclose under existing front porch canopy'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Howard Road is a residential street characterised by detached or semi-detached two storey dwellings of a similar scale and appearance. The appeal property is a detached property of traditional form and proportions, incorporating a front gable and pitched roof. It also has an open single storey sloping roof projection at the rear.
4. The proposal would include a flat roofed two storey rear extension. The Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Design Guide' (2013) (SPD) sets out that with regards to two storey rear extensions, *the roof should relate well to the host property and its existing roof* and that *'Flat roofs should generally be avoided unless a flat roof is a feature of the existing building'*.
5. I acknowledge that the SPD is guidance which should be assessed on a case-by-case basis, including for different elements of one development. However, whilst modest in depth, the flat roof of the extension would appear in stark contrast to the existing roof form and appearance of the rear elevation. It would not relate well to the host property and would result in a dominant and obtrusive form of development.
6. Whilst the single storey extension would also be flat roofed, given its limited height, it would not have a comparable visual impact as the two storey element. Similarly, the dormer, whilst substantial in scale, would be seen in the context of the existing roof form. Even in the context of these two additions,

the two storey element would appear prominent and incongruous. Harm to the character and appearance of the existing property would therefore occur.

7. Whilst there are no direct neighbours to the rear, the two storey extension would be visible to both adjoining neighbours and in glimpses from Blagdon Road to the south. The extension would therefore detract from the character and appearance of the wider street scene.
8. Notwithstanding the above, the Council does not raise any issue with the single storey extension, dormer or front porch. From everything which has been seen on the site visit and in submissions, I have no reason to disagree.
9. I acknowledge the lack of harm to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties; however, this is a neutral factor which does not weigh in favour of the development. Similarly, the improvement to the internal accommodation of the property does not alter my conclusions on the main issue.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Kingston Core Strategy (2012), and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) which collectively set out that development should recognise and respond to distinctive local features and character and incorporate principles of good design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

B Phillips

INSPECTOR