

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2023

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/23/3315979

3 Manor Close, Worcester Park KT4 7PJ

- 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 and Mrs Garry against the decision of The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref. 22/03573/HOU, dated 10 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a single storey side/rear extension and a first-floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential cul-de-sac comprising two storey semi-detached houses of an Arts & Craft style which have been altered and extended over time. No 3 has been enlarged in the past with the original side catslide roof being converted to full two storeys, as is apparent elsewhere in the close.
4. One common feature within Manor Close is the spacing between dwellings and whilst a number have been extended to their respective side boundaries, these tend to be single storey elements. The proposal would give rise to the erosion of the visual gap between the appeal dwelling and 5 Manor Close with a full two storey extension proposed to be constructed within close proximity to the shared boundary: notwithstanding a 250mm and 600mm gap at ground floor and first floor respectively.
5. I note that discussions were held between the appellants and an Officer of the Council, although ultimately any such advice can only be construed as being informal and would not bind the Local Planning Authority to making a particular decision at a later date. Whilst I note reference to an extension opposite at 2 Manor Close, I have not been provided with the full details of that but nonetheless ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.

6. The setting in off the shared boundary for this particular case is less than that advocated by the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document. The proposal would lead to the erosion of the existing visual gap between nos 3 and 5 and whilst I think to say that a terracing effect would be created is slightly tenuous, nonetheless the proposal would give rise to a harmful effect upon the existing character of the street scene; notwithstanding that the proposed hipped roof would lessen the impact of the proposal at roof level and that no objections had been raised by the Council in respect to the effect upon the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring residential properties.
7. In conclusion on this matter I find that by virtue of the scale and siting of the proposed first floor side extension, that the scheme would visually fill the site which would lead to the erosion of the existing gap between nos 3 and 5 and consequently would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy adopted 2012, which together require the primary suburban character of the Borough to be protected, that proposals seek to ensure that new development recognises distinctive local features and character having regard to principles of good design, and, amongst other things, plot width and format which includes spaces between buildings.

Conclusion

8. Therefore, having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR