The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/22/3306894
14 Hatch Place, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 5NB

- 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 Marco Teuma against the decision of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Council.
- The application Ref 22/02302/HOU dated 14 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2022.
- The development proposed is single storey front extension with rooflights.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the original property, streetscene and visual amenities of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey, mid-terrace, dwellinghouse located within the cul-de-sac of Hatch Place. The proposal seeks to construct a single storey extension to the front of the property which would extend around 1.5m from an existing protrusion to the front elevation. The appellant has utilised the Design Statement, submitted as part of the original application, as their appeal statement.

4. At the time of my site visit I noted that numbers 14 to 17 Hatch Place (inclusive) share a clear and uniform building line. In addition I noted that the front protrusion of the appeal site is, when viewed from the West (towards the end of the cul-de-sac), already forward of the building line of adjacent numbers 12 and 13 Hatch Place. Overall, the general uniformity within Hatch Place is noticeable and is a characteristic of the original host property, the row within which is stands and street scene. I do not find the streetscape to be undulating but rather that it has been laid out and constructed in notable rows of dwellings which share building lines, within each row, before progressing to the next row of dwellings.

5. The uniform building line of 14 to 17 Hatch Place, viewed from the West, is currently partly obscured by the vegetation to the front of the appeal site where the extension is proposed but this vegetation would be removed. In general views within Hatch Place, the proposal would project forward of the uniform building line and cause disruption to this overall uniformity when

considering the appearance of the row within which the appeal site stands. I find that this would be the case regardless of whether the appeal site is at the end of the row which shares the common building line as opposed to being within that row itself. Adding to the existing projection, particularly when viewed from the West as shown in the proposed streetscape imagery, I find would result in a discordant and incongruous feature that would be detrimental to the rhythm of the streetscene and the visual amenity of the area.

6. The proposal would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the original property which is presently consistent with neighbouring properties and fails to respect the symmetry and features of the existing front elevations. I find that the proposed streetscape images submitted show that the proposal would be a dominant feature to the front elevation of the host dwelling.

7. I note the submissions reference properties opposite the appeal site (4 and 5 Hatch Place) having been extended in the early 2000s. Such proposals would not have been assessed against the current Local Plan as is the starting point for the proposal before me in accordance with S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. Reference is also made to 28 Hatch Place having been granted permission in 2019, however, no further details have been submitted before me. Notwithstanding this each case must be considered on its own merits and this does not change my assessment of the appeal site within its location, and the row of dwellings within which the appeal site is part of, as outlined above.

8. It is noted that the proposal does not impact upon, nor does the refusal reason raise any issues relating to, neighbouring amenity nor existing parking provision for the host dwelling. I also acknowledge the appellant has offered to replace the hedges and trees with alternative planting. These are, however, a neutral consideration and do not outweigh the main issues I have identified as outlined above with regard to impacting upon the streetscene, general uniformity and the host building itself.

9. The proposal would fail to be consistent with London Plan 2021 Policy D3 which requires developments to respond to the existing character of a place and enhance local context by responding to existing building types, forms and proportions. The proposal would also fail to be consistent with Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2012 (CS) Policy CS8 which seeks to secure good design and that new development relates well and connects with its surroundings and CS Policy DM10 which identifies essential elements with regard to building line build up, set back and front boundaries.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR