



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/24/3346068

124 Richmond Park Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 6AL

- 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 Ronald Crawford against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/00034/HOU.
 - The development proposed is to extend upwards to provide an additional floor, in the form of a mansard type roof with dormers front and rear.
-

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, the wider terrace and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two storey, mid terraced dwelling located close to the junction of Richmond Park Road and Acre Road. The terrace comprises 6no. dwellings and is relatively uniform appearance, despite the different paint colours to the front elevations and some differences in terms of the design of the front porches and rear extensions.
4. A parapet runs along the entire front façade of the terrace which conceals the inverted roof forms behind it. The proposal is for a mansard type roof extension, with dormer windows to the front and rear. The roof extension would extend about 1.3m above the existing parapet and the side party walls and chimney would also be raised.
5. The proposed roof extension would therefore be significantly higher than the original roof form of the remainder of the terrace. It would be highly visible from Richmond Park Road where due to its height above the parapet and the existing roof form, it would stand out as a bulky, incongruous and discordant addition to the dwelling which would also disrupt the architectural uniformity and coherence of the remainder of the terrace.
6. The rear elevation of the proposed roof addition would also be highly prominent when viewed from Acre Road. Whilst I acknowledge that part of the original inverted roof form would be retained, the extension would, nonetheless, appear

as a bulky, inharmonious addition to the dwelling which would also be at odds with the original roof form of the remainder of the terrace. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area due to its prominence and incongruous appearance.

7. I acknowledge that paragraph 124(e) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) gives support to mansard roof extensions in certain circumstances. It states, amongst other things, that planning policies and decisions should allow mansard roof extensions on suitable properties where their external appearance harmonises with the original building, including extensions to terraces where one or more of the terraced houses already has a mansard.
8. However, in this case there are no other mansard roof extensions on the terrace and in my view, the proposed extension would fail to harmonise satisfactorily with the existing building or the remainder of the terrace. I acknowledge the appellant's comments that other occupiers of dwellings in the same terrace may wish to undertake a similar form of development, however, I have no such proposals before me and there is no certainty that this would happen.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the wider terrace and the surrounding area. Thus, I find it would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DM10 of the Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy (2012) which, amongst other matters, 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

10. The appellant states that the Council are unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and that the tilted balance should apply. However, the proposal is for a householder extension and therefore this matter is of little relevance to the appeal as it would not result in an increase in housing stock. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide improved residential accommodation and would make the effective use of land as encouraged by the Framework and the London Plan. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that the development would cause to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the wider terrace and the area.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR