



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/24/3344709

16 Beresford Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 6LR

- 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 Paul Clasper against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/00043/HOU.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion to facilitate 2 additional bedrooms and a bathroom. Brickwork, tiles and windows to match existing building. Roof profile to match neighbouring properties.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion to facilitate 2 additional bedrooms and a bathroom. Brickwork, tiles and windows to match existing building. Roof profile to match neighbouring properties at 16 Beresford Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 6LR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00043/HOU, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule of conditions.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling with front and rear facing shallow gables. The surrounding area comprises mostly of a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced Victorian and Edwardian period properties. Many of the dwellings in Beresford Road and in nearby Canbury Road have undergone various extensions and alterations, including large roof extensions.
4. The proposal is for a loft conversion, involving the raising the roof and the erection of hip to gable and rear roof extensions. The hip to gable extensions would reflect the design and appearance of the neighbouring dwellings and the resultant ridge height would also be similar. The proposed gable roof would slope away from the front facing original gable so that other than for its roof shape, the existing dwelling would retain much of its original character and appearance when viewed from the front, including its distinctive decorative front gable and bay window. The proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area in this regard.

5. The proposed extensions would add considerably to the scale and bulk of the host dwelling and would incorporate a flat roof and a vertical rear elevation, giving the appearance of a three storey flat roof dwelling when viewed from the rear. The proposal would not, in this respect, comply with the Council's non-statutory design guidance set out in their Residential Design Supplementary Planning Guidance (2013) (SPD).
6. The side profile of the proposed extensions including the flat roof section would be glimpsed from Beresford Road. However, many of the dwellings along Beresford Road have been extended in a similar way and the side profile of the proposed development would be the same as that which is commonplace along Beresford Road and neighbouring Canbury Road, including that of the neighbouring dwellings at Nos 18 and 20 Beresford Road. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the street scene in this regard.
7. Whilst some of the nearby roof alterations incorporate large box-like tiled dormers with little or no set back from the eaves, others are visible with brick faces which are of a similar design to the appeal proposal. I acknowledge that some of the extensions may have been carried out in accordance with permitted development rights, however the appellant has highlighted several examples nearby where the Council have granted planning permission for extensions of a similar design and appearance, including at 26 Canbury Avenue and 32 Canbury Avenue, which are visible from the appeal site through the gap to the side of 1 Beresfield Road, and at 57 Canbury Avenue. Whilst the rear elevation of the proposed development would be visible from neighbouring gardens, it would be viewed in the same context as other extensions and alterations of a similar scale and design along Beresford Road.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have not a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area. It would comply with Policy DM10 of the Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 which, amongst other matters, require development to ensure that the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area is respected, maintained or enhanced.

Conditions

9. 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.
10. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. The condition controlling materials is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the local area.
11. I have imposed a condition to control the insertion of additional windows and other openings in order to protect the living conditions of surrounding occupants.
12. The Council confirm that a Fire Safety Strategy was not submitted with the application. I shall therefore impose a condition requiring the submission of a

suitable Fire Safety Strategy in the interests of safety of all users of the building.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: Location Plan; Proposed Elevations (#1i,2a); Existing & Proposed Sections, Floor and Roof Plans (#1h,1j,1k,2a,2b); Site Plan – Existing and Proposed Ground Floor (#1e); Site Plan – Existing & Proposed First Floor (#1e); and Site Plan - Proposed Second Floor (#1e).
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the materials specified on the approved plans and on the application forms unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
- 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no windows shall be inserted nor any other openings formed (other than those expressly authorised by this permission) at first floor level in the proposed western flank elevation unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
- 5) Prior to any above-ground works of the development to which this permission relates, a Fire Safety Strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Fire Safety Strategy shall demonstrate how the development will achieve the highest standards of fire safety and shall include the following details:
 - 1) Suitable positioned outside space for the fire appliances /and evacuation assembly point;
 - 2) Appropriate fire alarm systems;
 - 3) Passive and active fire safety measures;
 - 4) Appropriate construction details to minimise the risk of the fire spread;
 - 5) Provision of suitable access and convenient means of escape / an evacuation strategy;
 - 6) Provision of suitable access and equipment for firefighting which is appropriate for the size and use of the development. The Fire Safety Strategy shall include a statement of competence.

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Strategy and thereafter maintained.

The required Fire Safety Strategy shall reference the London Plan Guidance Fire Safety (February 2022) where applicable and a Reasonable Exception Statement (RES) shall be submitted in relation to those fire safety requirements which the applicant does not consider to be relevant.

END