



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2023

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/23/3319851

20 Westfield Road, Surbiton, Kingston Upon Thames KT6 4EL

- 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 Ms Kim Cooper against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/00101/HOU, dated 15 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is new rear, first floor extension over ground floor footprint of existing kitchen/dining room; new window on existing ground floor side elevation to kitchen/diner.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new rear, first floor extension over ground floor footprint of existing kitchen/dining room; new window on existing ground floor side elevation to kitchen/diner at 20 Westfield Road, Surbiton, Kingston Upon Thames KT6 4EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00101/HOU, dated 15 January 2023, 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:

A3/20 Proposed Ground Floor Plan; A3/21 Proposed First Floor Plan;
A3/22 Proposed Roof Plan; A3/23 Proposed Section;
A3/24 Proposed Side Elevation; A3/25 Proposed Rear Elevation;
A4/02 Proposed Block Plan; and, A4/01 Location Plan.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the materials specified on the approved plans.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Westfield Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Westfield Road is part of a residential area to the west of Surbiton town centre, extending to the river Thames. It is a residential street containing traditional 2-storey houses of various designs and types, some of which have been extended or altered, and which generally have small front gardens and somewhat larger rear gardens.
4. The appeal property is located at the eastern end of a short row of 2-storey terraced houses. The houses are constructed of brick with pitched slate roofs, and many of them have sliding sash windows. The neighbouring terraces on Westfield Road, and the dwellings opposite have predominantly rendered finishes. The appeal property is located in what is described as the Cleaveland Road/The Mall Local Area of Special Character (LASC), a non-designated heritage asset.
5. The appeal property has been extended at some point with a 2-storey, pitched-roof side extension set back from the main front elevation, and with a single storey, flat-roofed extension in the rear garden, which is not visible from the street.
6. The next door property to the west, No 21, has a similar sized single storey rear extension that adjoins the rear extension at the appeal dwelling. Other dwellings along Westfield Road, and on the parallel street to the north Cleaveland Road, also within the LASC, have been extended at the rear, including at first floor level.
7. The extended appeal dwelling is generally similar in appearance to the other houses in the terrace and is not out of keeping with the mixed character and appearance of the LASC.
8. The proposed development would entail the erection of a first floor extension above the existing rear extension, with a pitched gable roof of a similar design and appearance to the roof of the host building. The proposed extension would be constructed of yellow London stock bricks and slate tiles to match the existing. A total of three small rooflights would be added to the roof of the proposal.
9. Whilst the proposal would not be visible from Westfield Road or other nearby streets, it would be visible from the rear elevations and gardens of nearby dwellings. However, after visiting the site and observing the rear elevations of other nearby dwellings on Westfield Road and Cleaveland Road, I consider the scale, massing and traditional design and materials of the proposal would not be out of keeping with the LASC.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, accord with Policies D3 (optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) and HC1 (heritage conservation and growth) of the London Plan¹ 2021 (the LP), and with Policies CS8 (character, design and heritage), DM10 (design requirements for new developments (including House Extensions)) and, DM12 (development in conservation areas and affecting heritage assets) of the Local Development

¹ The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London

Framework Core Strategy 2012 (the CS), and with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework).

Living Conditions

11. The appeal proposal would extend some six metres from the principal rear elevation of the appeal building, above the existing single storey rear extension and adjacent to the boundary with No 21.
12. I visited No 21 when I was in the area and the position of the proposal by the boundary, together with its scale and massing, means it would reduce the outlook from the rear first floor room at No 21. The western side of the proposed extension would be less than 1.5 metres from the window to this habitable room at its closest point.
13. Whilst there is no dispute between the parties that the proposed development would comply with the BRE guidelines for daylight and sunlight, the proposal would be harmful and would be contrary to the guidance contained in the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (the SPD).
14. However, given the limited height of the proposal above the first floor rear window at No 21, together with the largely unrestricted outlook directly to the rear and towards the west from this window, I do not consider this harm would be prohibitive, in this case.
15. For these reasons, the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Westfield Road, with particular regard to outlook. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the CS, and with the Framework.

Conditions and Conclusion

16. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition specifying the approved drawings would be necessary for reasons of certainty.
17. A condition requiring the materials of the proposed development to match those specified on the approved drawings would be necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area, and for the avoidance of doubt.
18. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR