



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/23/3331992

281 Park Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 5LW

- 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 Luus against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 23/01444/HOU, dated 30 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a side dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a detached two-storey dwelling which has previously been significantly extended. These extensions include a narrow extension to the side which has a lower ridge height than the host dwelling, and two side dormer extensions.
4. The appeal proposal is for a dormer on the northern side of the dwelling. There is already a shallow dormer on this elevation. This dormer would be retained, with the new dormer extending to the side of it. The proposed dormer would be set further back from the front elevation than the existing dormer that it would adjoin and would broadly align with the large dormer extension on the southern side of the dwelling.
5. The proposed dormer would sit partly within the plane of the hip roof above the first-floor side extension. Whilst it would be set down from the main ridge and slightly up from the eaves of the extension it would however extend beyond the roof plane of the original dwelling. Accordingly, it would appear as a bulky, incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the dwelling which would be harmful to its character and appearance. It would be contrary to the design guidance set out in the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD) which states that dormer windows should be designed to complement the character of the existing house and wider area.

6. I acknowledge that the dormer would not be dissimilar in size to the dormer on the southern side of the dwelling. However, that dormer sits within the main roof plane of the host dwelling and therefore appears subservient to the host dwelling.
7. The proposed dormer would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling which would help to reduce its visual prominence in the street scene. When approaching from the north, views of it would also be partly obscured by the adjacent dwelling in Stable Close together with existing mature vegetation to the front of it. Nonetheless, views of it would still be obtainable from Park Road and the pavements either side and from neighbouring gardens where it would appear as an incongruous addition to the property and as such, harmful to the wider character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. I also note that the property benefitted from a Lawful Development Certificate¹ in 2018 for the erection of a hip to gable and rear and side dormer roof additions. However, I have no further details of this Certificate which appears to be for a different form of development to the appeal proposal. I also acknowledge that the adjacent dwelling, 279 Park Road has a large dormer on its side elevation. However, I have no further details before me and in any event, that dormer would appear to sit on the roof plane of the original dwelling and is not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Thus, I find it would be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy (2012) and the SPD which, amongst other matters, require the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area to be respected, maintained or enhanced.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA ref. 18/12741/LDP