



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2023

by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/22/3292762

9 Cotterill Road, Surbiton, Surrey KT6 7UW

- 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 Mike D'Souza against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 21/00950/HOU, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at 9 Cotterill Road, Surbiton, Surrey KT6 7UW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/00950/HOU, dated 25 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: No 03 Ground floor plan proposed; No 04 First floor, roof plan and elevations as proposed; and No 05 Location and block plans.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan No 04.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has indicated that he wishes to make some minor changes to the design of the proposed development from that shown on the plans submitted with the planning application. No revised plans have been provided, so I have considered this appeal based on the plans submitted with the planning application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached house set within a corner plot on a bend in Cotterill Road. The house is constructed in red brick, with traditional tiling on the roof and ornamental tiles on the face of the first floor.

The windows are of a traditional design. The front entrance is set within a projecting, gable-ended two-storey bay with a window at first floor level.

5. The character of the surrounding area is suburban and residential, with predominantly two-storey semi-detached and detached houses in a variety of mostly traditional styles. The appeal site is unusual within the local area because of the size and shape of the plot.
6. The front and rear building lines would be continued from the host dwelling to the proposed development. The proposed height is consistent with that of the original house. The inclusion of a second two-storey bay at the front of the house, of similar proportions and detailing to the existing one, would give a degree of balance to the form of the frontage. The proposed windows are of a similar style to the existing ones. The use of matching materials would also respect the design of the original dwelling and could be controlled by condition.
7. For these reasons, the elevations of the proposed extension would appear integral to the building as a whole. However, the slight set-down of the roofline from the existing roof would provide a break and ensure the new section would appear subordinate to the rest of the dwelling. Taking all that into account, the proposed extension would respect the character and appearance of the existing building.
8. The proposed extension would be clearly visible from a range of viewpoints along Cotterill Road. However, given the size of the plot and distance from other buildings, the bulk and massing of the extension would not appear unduly dominant. Its form and detailing would generally complement rather than conflict with the varied styles of the other houses in the local area.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing house and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan; Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames (RBKT) Local Development Framework Core Strategy; or Policy Guidance 36 in the RBKT Residential Design Guide Supplementary Document. These policies require development to relate well to its surroundings and respect the local distinctiveness of an area through its scale, layout, height, form, massing and design detail.

Conditions

10. A condition is necessary requiring materials in accordance with those shown on the approved plan to integrate the appearance of the proposed extension with that of the original building. I have amended the wording from that proposed by the Council for clarity.
11. The Council has suggested a condition to seek approval prior to commencement of details of secure cycle-parking facilities and to require the permanent retention thereof. I consider there would be sufficient space within the site, or in the externally accessed storage area in the proposed extension, for the secure parking of cycles. I therefore conclude such a condition would not be necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Carpenter

INSPECTOR