



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/23/3329949

74 Brockenhurst Avenue, Worcester Park, Surrey KT4 7RF

- 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 Gratien David Pillai against the decision of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/01488/HOU, dated 2 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the garage, conservatory and rear extension and the erection of single-storey rear/side wraparound extension and first floor and roof extensions. Internal and facade alterations, and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development is taken from the Council's decision notice as this more comprehensively and accurately describes the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one-half of a semi-detached pair with a catslide roof to the side. This house style is replicated along Brockenhurst Avenue interspersed with semi-detached properties with hipped roofs and a number of detached properties. The form of the residential properties and their roof profile is a notable aspect contributing to the local character.
5. Planning permission has been granted (Council reference 23/00745/HOU) for alterations to the property including the single-storey extensions, and at the time of my site visit a rear extension was under construction. Thereby the main aspect in dispute is the removal of the catslide and the creation of a full first floor with a hipped roof. To that end, I agree with the Council that the catslide form is a distinctive feature of the property and the alteration would result in a loss of symmetry to the semi-detached pair.
6. I acknowledge that many of the properties along Brockenhurst Avenue have been altered and there is some variation between each half of the semi-detached pairs. However, generally, these are limited to particular features and

the original form is still identifiable. The dormer windows to the side of the appeal property are different to those to the other side at No.76, and whilst the appellant suggests that the roof is not the original there is no evidence before me to support that. Moreover, the catside is an integral and distinguishable design feature of the building as a whole.

7. Policy DM 10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Core Strategy 2012 (CS) seeks to ensure that the most essential elements identified as contributing to the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area are respected, maintained or enhanced, including a) the prevailing development typology, including housing types, and c) the scale, layout, height, form (including roof forms), and massing.
8. The proposed development would dominate the property, add significant bulk at roof level and completely change its form. Whilst hipped roofs are found within the vicinity, they are primarily part of a different house type. The appellant has drawn my attention to Nos.50 and 52 where a similar development to the appeal proposal has occurred. The background to that scheme is not before me and, in my view, illustrates how the character of a property can be significantly diminished. Such changes are not prevalent, particularly to the properties with a catside roof where a change to the profile is more noticeable. I nonetheless accept that the property has the capacity to be extended, but in this instance due to its form and lack of subservience, the proposed development would be harmful to the appearance of the building and would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development.
9. The proposed materials would match the existing property, and there would be no increase in height or harmful loss of space to the side of the property. nevertheless, these are neutral matters and do not outweigh the harm I have found.
10. The development would therefore conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the CS and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 (LP) which together seek to secure good quality development which responds to the context of the host dwelling and area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR