



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2023

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/23/3330796

14 Riverside Close, Kingston Upon Thames KT1 2JF

- 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 Michael Moran against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref:23/01595/HOU dated 15 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing rear conservatory, erection of single storey rear, first floor side extension. Hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer and installation of 4 no. front roof lights to facilitate loft conversion; internal alteration
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing rear conservatory, erection of single storey rear, first floor side extension. Hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer and installation of 4 no. front roof lights to facilitate loft conversion; internal alteration at 14 Riverside Close, Kingston Upon Thames KT1 2JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref:23/01595/HOU dated 15 June 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1800/50; 1800/1; 1800/10; 1800/2; 1800/3; 1800/4; 1800/5; 1800/6; 1800/7; 1800/8; 1800/8; 1800/30; 1800/31; 1800/32; 1800/33; 1800/34; 1800/35; 1800/36; 1800/37; 1800/38; 1800/39.
 - 4) The proposed first floor window in the side (east) elevation of the development hereby permitted shall be glazed with obscure glass and fixed shut to a height of 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the room in which the window is installed and thereafter so retained.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised in December 2023. Although some of the paragraph numbering has changed, I do not consider that there are any material changes in the Framework, pertinent to this appeal proposal. It is not therefore necessary to seek the views of the Appellant or the Council on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed extensions, with particular reference to the roof extensions and side extension on the character and appearance of the existing building and the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached residential dwelling on the south side of Riverside Close which is a no-through road, leading off the A307. The surrounding residential dwellings are a mix of both detached and semi-detached. Although the houses appear to date from a similar period, the interwar period, there is some variation in the design, and a number have been subsequently altered and extended. There is therefore a range of open gaps to the side boundaries, with some being open at first floor above the garages, as exemplified by the house as existing, whilst others have built to the side, leaving much narrower gaps to the side boundaries.
5. The proposal would extend above the existing garage, set in from the side boundary at first floor level, with a gable end. At ground floor level there would be a rear extension across the extended rear elevation. The existing roof hip would become a gable end. The first floor side extension would be set back from the main front elevation and the roof ridge set down from the main roof ridge. There would be a dormer across the extended rear roof slope.
6. The side extension would be set in from the side boundary and also set back from the front elevation of the existing house. The roof line would also be set down from the main ridge line of the existing roof, as extended to accommodate the hip to gable extension. As a result of the proposed design, I consider that the side extension would appear as a subordinate extension to the main dwelling. It would also allow the form and the design features of the existing house, including the front bay and gable over as well as the cat slide roof to be retained as the distinctive features, shared with the attached semi-detached house, and prominent in street scene views.
7. I agree with the Council that hip to gable extensions have been undertaken elsewhere in the local vicinity, including at the adjacent property at No 16. The proposed hip to gable roof extensions would be acceptable in this respect and would respect the varied street scene.
8. At the rear the proposed single storey rear extension would be of modest proportions in terms of its depth. Although it would extend the full width of the extended property, its modest depth would result in it being seen as a subordinate addition to the main house. The Council has also raised no concerns in this regard.
9. The rear dormer would extend across much of the extended roof slope, albeit with small margins to the side boundaries. It would be well set down from the

main roof ridge and slightly up from the eaves line. I have noted the concerns of the Council with the proposed rear dormer, but given its set down from the main roof, I do not consider that it would be an over dominant addition to the rear roof slope. I do not therefore agree with the Council that it would be a top heavy addition to the roof.

10. The proposed rear dormer would not be widely seen in street scene views, but it would be seen in oblique views from the road when approaching from the east. However, other dormer additions are seen in the same way. I am therefore satisfied that it would respect the character and appearance of the local area.
11. Overall, I consider that the individual elements as well as the overall proposal have been well designed and would not detract from the form and features of the existing property. Furthermore, the proposal would respect the varied street scene.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposal, taken as a whole, would respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling as well as of the local area. There would be no conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policy DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy 2102 and the Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other things seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Conditions

13. In terms of conditions, I agree with the Council that the materials should match the existing to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area, and the approved plans should be listed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning. I shall also add a condition, as requested by the Council, to require the side facing window at first floor to be obscure glazed and fixed shut to a height of 1.7 metres above the finished floor level of the room to protect the amenities of surrounding neighbours. There are a number of existing windows in the existing house also along the east elevation, but it would not be reasonable to seek for these to be in obscure glass, as they are not affected by the proposed works.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR