

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/23/3335087

81A Bonner Hill Road, Kingston upon Thames KT11 3EU

- 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 Kuhlbrodt against the decision of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref. 23/02105/HOU, dated 1 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of the garage and construction of a two storey side extension and rear roof extension comprising a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2023, but there are no material changes relevant to the substance of the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace house to the north west of the junction of Bonner Hill Road and Piper Road. There exists an attached single storey garage to the flank elevation with a quite prominent single storey flat roof side/rear extension behind.
5. The garage would be demolished to make way for the two storey side extension with a staggered flank elevation to enable it to fit within the tapered side boundary. This would be built in close proximity to this, far exceeding the building line created by 40–22 (evens) Piper Road and narrowing the visual gateway into that road, running counter to the more spacious and verdant setback on the opposite side at 29 Piper Road.
6. The rear elevation and roof slope of no81A is highly visible from Piper Road, as are a number of large slate-clad dormer roof extensions due west along Bonner Hill Road. Whilst it is not for me to comment on the appropriateness of these examples, the proposed dormer would be very much in the foreground of this view. The eastern cheek of the dormer would be in line with the existing flank elevation of

the host dwelling and would protrude above the rear roof slope of the two storey side extension, appearing as an incongruous addition.

7. This incongruity would be accentuated by the lack of set down from the increased ridge line of the main range and whilst I acknowledge that this is to achieve adequate internal head heights, respectfully I consider this is a situation of form following function.
8. The scheme is not without its merits and the two storey side extension in itself would appear subordinate to no81A, although it cannot be viewed in isolation; and overall its impact upon the character and appearance of the street scene would be one that is cramped in nature, notwithstanding that the recessed green wall section of the eastern elevation would be quite an interesting feature.
9. I acknowledge that the scheme was the subject of a pre-application submission and the Officer response was not unduly negative. However, such advice is only ever given in good faith and does not bind a local planning authority to make a particular decision at a later date. The rear dormer roof extension would appear excessive in scale and would not relate well to the host dwelling, which would be compounded by its highly exposed location within the public realm. This would be contrary to the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document adopted July 2013 (SPD) which requires dormers to be set down from the ridge line of the existing roof by at least 500mm and up from the eaves by the same amount. Whilst the fenestration would line up with that below at first floor level, I consider that the dormer would not complement the design of the existing house or wider area which is generally characterised by vernacular architecture.
10. In coming to these conclusions I have had regard to the planning history appertaining to the site, as well as the reasons behind the scheme, including enhancing the environmental performance of the building whilst also improving the internal living accommodation for the appellant's family, which I commend. However, these factors that fall in favour of the scheme do not outweigh the harm that would ensue upon the character and appearance of the area.
11. Further, I acknowledge the permitted development option advanced by the appellant, however it falls to me to determine the appeal proposal that is before me on its merits, and due to the comments regarding the need for head height, I am not convinced that this would constitute a feasible fallback option.
12. Therefore, in addition to conflicting with the SPD, I also find that the scheme conflicts with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Core Strategy adopted April 2012 which together seek to protect the primarily suburban character of the Borough, by requiring good design and to enhance local distinctiveness, including scale and layout, height, form (including roof forms) and massing.

Conclusion

13. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR