



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/24/3342661

81A Bonner Hill Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT1 3EU

- 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 Kuhlbrodt against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 23/02860/HOU.
 - The development proposed is Hip to gable and 2nos. rear dormer roof extensions, with installation of 2nos. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Hip to gable and 2nos. rear dormer roof extensions, with installation of 2nos. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion at 81A Bonner Hill Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT1 3EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/02860/HOU, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: WRAP-A-A0150 Rev 7 (Proposed Location and Site Plan); WRAP-A-A0170 Rev 9 (Proposed Elevations); WRAP-A-A0160, Rev 8 (Proposed Plans); and WRAP-A-A0180 Rev 8 (Proposed sections).
 3. 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.
 4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and reenacting that Order with or without modification), no additions or enlargements to the roof of the dwellinghouse (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) shall be erected unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Preliminary Matter

2. The original description of the proposed development on the application forms also included the 'demolition of the garage and construction of a single storey side extension'. However, these aspects were subsequently removed from the application and I have therefore used the Council's amended description of the development in the above banner heading.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling, located in an area comprising a mix of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings.
5. The proposal would involve raising the ridge height of the dwelling by about 0.26m, a hip to gable extension with two rear roof dormers and the installation of two front rooflights.
6. The appeal property is located at the end a terrace comprising 4no. dwellings. Ground levels fall from east to west so that each individual dwelling within the terrace steps down in height. The ridge height of the appeal property is therefore already slightly higher than that of the adjoining dwelling. Within this context, the proposed small increase in ridge height would not be particularly apparent and would not be read as a discordant feature in the street scene.
7. The appeal property occupies a corner plot and the proposed hip to gable extension would be highly visible from adjoining roads. However, there are other examples of properties along Bonner Hill Road and Piper Road with gable roof forms and the proposed hip to gable extension would not be out of keeping with the street scene. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the proposal would not unacceptably unbalance the appearance of the terrace particularly as the dwelling at the opposing end of the terrace has a part gable-ended roof. The staggered height of the terrace also reduces its symmetry.
8. The Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (SPD), whilst non-statutory, provides useful design guidance for dormer windows. The proposed dormers would comply with most aspects of the guidance although they would only be set down from the newly raised ridgeline of the dwelling by 0.16m which is less than the 0.5m set down recommended in the SPD.
9. The dormers would however be set-in from sides and set-in from the eaves of the dwelling such that they would not overly dominate the rear roof slope. The dormers would also broadly align with the windows below as required by the SPD. Whilst the dormers would be highly visible in the street scene due to the siting of the dwelling on a corner plot, they would be seen in the same context as other larger dormers in the area, including on nos. 83 and 85 Bonner Hill Road on the opposite side of the junction with Piper Road. I therefore conclude that the dormers would be of an acceptable appearance and would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the proposed rooflights would be small in size and would not be overly dominant on the front roof slope.
10. Therefore, in conclusion, despite some conflict with the guidance contained within the SPD, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Thus, I find it would comply with Policy DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy (2012), which amongst other matters, requires the

character and local distinctiveness of a street or area to be respected, maintained or enhanced.

Other Matters

11. I am satisfied that the appeal proposal would not result in any significant loss of light, privacy or outlook to neighbouring occupiers given the existing urban environment and the respective siting and separation distances between dwellings.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested a list of planning conditions in the event that this appeal was to be allowed. I have incorporated most of the suggested conditions, with some adjustments for clarity.
13. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition controlling the use of materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area. I have imposed a condition to control future roof additions and enlargements due to the prominent siting of the dwelling and the extent of roof additions and alterations granted by this permission.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR