



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23RD August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/24/3340237

Claremont House, Renfrew Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 7NT

- 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 Mr M Wood against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 23/02704/HOU.
 - The development proposed is removal of chimney stack and erection of dormer roof extensions to east and south elevations, together with installation on conservation rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the Coombe Wood Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a detached Edwardian dwelling, located within Coombe Wood Conservation Area (CA). Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. It is also within the Kingston Hill / Coombe Hill Strategic Area of Special Character.
4. The special character of the CA derives from the large Victorian, Edwardian, and 20th century properties set in a semi-rural street scene around open space occupied by the Coombe Wood Golf Course. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling (with attic in roof area), constructed in red brick with a clay tiled pitched roof. The south facing projecting balcony with timber balustrade and the tall chimney stacks are prominent features of the dwelling. The dwelling is located within a large, landscaped plot and is consistent with the prevailing character and appearance of the CA. Accordingly, it positively contributes to its significance.
5. The site is screened by the existing close boarded fence and trees and hedges along its boundaries. However, as I observed on site, relatively clear views of the dwelling are obtainable from Renfrew Road as well as more fleeting

glimpses from George Road. The eastern elevation of the dwelling is also visible from the adjacent golf course car park.

6. The proposed dormer on the south elevation of the dwelling would be of considerable width. Whilst it would be set in from sides and the eaves of the roof, it would nonetheless be a dominant feature due to a combination of its width and height. It would, in my view, detract significantly from the original roof form of the dwelling with its width and extent of glazing exceeding that of the other openings below. As a result, it would represent a bulky addition which would be out of keeping with the host dwelling and would be harmful to its character and appearance. The southern elevation of the dwelling is visible from Renfrew Road in particular, and as the proposed dormer would diminish the architectural integrity and merit of the dwelling, it would also result in some harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
7. The proposed dormer on the eastern elevation of the dwelling would be smaller than the main dormer but would still represent an overly dominant addition to the roof due to its size and scale. Furthermore, the proposal would result in the loss of a prominent chimney stack which, together with the decorative brick detailing below, is a distinctive feature of the dwelling which is visible from outside of the site. Whilst the brick detailing on the flank wall and other chimney stacks on the dwelling would be retained, I consider that the loss of the most prominent chimney stack would be harmful to the original character and appearance of the dwelling and would diminish the contribution it makes to the wider CA.
8. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal would not alter the important landscape character of the plot, for the above reasons I find that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA as a whole.
9. Accordingly, the proposal would have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset. However, given the relatively small scale of the proposal, this would be less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a whole. Paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework indicates that in such circumstances the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. No public benefits have been advanced in this case.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding CA. In addition to the conflict with national policy and legislation identified above, the proposal would also be contrary to Policies CS8, DM10 and DM12 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Core Strategy 2012. Together these policies seek to protect the district's heritage assets and require development proposals to enhance local context and to ensure that the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area is respected, maintained or enhanced.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to other examples of development in the CA, including the demolition of an existing dwelling and erection of a new single dwelling at Greystoke, Stoke Road, and large extensions to Stoke House, Stoke Road. However, I do not have the benefit of the full details of these proposals, or an assessment of the contribution the original buildings made to the character and appearance of the CA. I therefore place only limited weight on

these examples. In any event, I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no other material considerations to outweigh that finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR