



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/24/3343287

50 Leyfield, Worcester Park, Kingston Upon Thames, KT4 7LR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Gareth Mason against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/00108/HOU.
 - The development proposed is ground floor rear and side extension, first floor side extension and loft conversion to include a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The appeal proposal is described on the Council's decision notice as: *erection of a part two storey/part 1st floor side, first floor front extension, single storey rear and front extension and rear dormer with gabled roof extension and conversion of garage to habitable room and associated fenestration alterations*. I consider that this is a fuller and more accurate description of the proposal than that on the application form set out above and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main issue

3. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 50 Leyfield is a two storey semi-detached house typical of the surrounding area which is predominantly of similar houses in a style characteristic of 'Metroland' development. Common design features include two storey projecting front bow windows with tile hanging, small first floor oriel windows, plain or roughcast render with brick detailing and tiled hipped roofs.
5. The relevant policies in this case include CS8 of the Council's Core Strategy adopted 2012 (the Core Strategy) which relates to design and seeks to protect the suburban character of the Borough from inappropriate development. The Council also refers to policy DM12 which concerns conservation areas and heritage assets and is not directly relevant here as the Council has not indicated that the property is in either category.

6. The Council's Residential Design SPD adopted 2013 (the SPD) offers detailed advice on extensions to houses and dormer windows. Two storey side extensions should remain subordinate to the original house and the roof should relate well to the main house and its roof form. Hipped to gable roof extensions are identified as not usually appropriate, especially on semi-detached houses and among other things, side extensions to semi-detached houses should respect the symmetry of the adjoining property. Dormer windows should complement the original design of the house, particularly its roof form and they should not dominate the form of the existing roof.
7. I consider that the proposed two storey side extension would appear out of keeping with the character and appearance of the house, its immediate neighbour (No. 48) and the surroundings because of its design, size, form and mass. Although the proposed additional gable would reflect that at No. 48, the latter retains its hipped roof whereas the proposed hip to gable element at No. 50 would have a dominating appearance, would not be subordinate to the existing and would unbalance the overall appearance of the pair.
8. The proposed rear dormer would appear excessive in size and mass since it would extend the full width of the enlarged rear roof pitch with a minimal set back from the sides, eaves and ridge. It would dominate the rear roof and be at odds with the original design and character of the house.
9. There are numerous examples along Leyfield of extensions to similar semi-detached houses, some with hip to gable extensions and many two storey side extensions which have resulted in unbalanced pairs. However, the combination of a full two storey side extension and a hip to gable element is rare if not absent altogether. Of three properties opposite, one pair has similar side extensions to that at No. 48 and retains the hipped roof and one has a hip to gable extension to the original house. I have considered other examples put forward by the appellant, but have little or no information regarding the circumstances in which they were permitted. I have determined this appeal on its merits and in the context of the host building as one of a pair of semi-detached houses and its immediate surroundings.
10. I note that planning permission was granted in 2019 for a two storey side extension and rear dormer following amendments to the original scheme to remove a hip to gable element and to reduce the size of the rear dormer. I consider that the property is capable of extension but I am not persuaded that the combination of a hip to gable element and large rear dormer as proposed in this scheme would result in a satisfactory form of development in this context. It would appear dominant and visually intrusive and unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses.
11. I conclude that the proposed two storey side extension and rear dormer would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the wider street scene, contrary to Core Strategy policy CS8 and the SPD.
12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR