



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2025

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/24/3352672

39 Idmiston Road, Worcester Park, KT4 7ST

- 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 & Mrs Song & Jin against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/01273/HOU.
 - The development proposed is erection of part two storey and part single storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of part two storey and part single storey side and rear extensions at 39 Idmiston Road, Worcester Park, KT4 7ST in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 24/01273/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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall accord with the materials set out on the application forms and on the approved plans.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P01, P02, P03 Rev A, P04 Rev A, P05 Rev A, P103 Rev B, P104, P105 Rev B, Location Plan.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the submitted Fire Strategy.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have noted that the Council amended the description of development to refer to 'extension' in the singular rather than 'extensions' as set out on the application forms. I do not consider that the amendment is necessary, and I am satisfied that the Appellants' original description of development is accurate and have continued to use this in the decision.
3. There appear to be a discrepancy between the revision number for Plan P103 as recorded on the plan list and as shown on the submitted plan. I have referenced the revision number as shown on the submitted plan.

Main Issues

4. The main issues in this appeal are:

- The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the street scene, and
- The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbours of surrounding properties, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is an end of terrace two storey dwelling on the north-western side of Idmiston Road, and the flank elevation faces onto Idmiston Square as it turns towards Burford Road. It is situated in a predominantly residential area with a mix of properties. There are two existing single storey side extensions at the appeal property, the one towards the front has a hipped roof and the one to the rear a flat roof and both have different eaves height.
6. The proposal would seek to replace the flat roof single storey extension with a two storey side extension to the rear of the single storey extension. The extension would wrap around part way to the rear of the dwelling over a single storey rear extension the depth of the extended property. The single storey extension to the rear would be slightly deeper than the rear extension to the immediately adjoining property.
7. Although there would be a number of elements, the two storey extension would have a hipped roof which would step up from the remaining single storey side extension but would remain subordinate in height and scale to the main roof over the dwelling. There would be a part crown roof to the single storey rear extension, set behind a pitched roof surround.
8. Within the street scene, and particularly from the front and the side, I consider that the various elements would relate well together in terms of their scale and heights and would be seen as subordinate additions to the main house. The side extension would extend almost to the boundary line, but development over one and two storeys directly adjoining the street would not be out of character in the local area, given the presence of similar forms of development in the immediate vicinity. The reduced height in relation to the height of the main roof of the existing property would further assist so that the two storey side extension would not appear over dominant in the street scene.
9. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extensions would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the street scene. There would be no conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 (London Plan) and Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) as well as the Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Living Conditions

10. Given the siting of the appeal property at the eastern end of Idmiston Road at the junction with Idmiston Square and Burford Road, there is only one property facing

on to the side of the appeal property at No 77 Idmiston Square. However, the proposed side extension, given its siting towards the rear would not be directly opposite that dwelling. Given the distance between No 77 as well as the detailed siting of the proposed side extension, I am satisfied that the proposal would not be overbearing and as a result would not harm the outlook for the neighbours at No 77.

11. The adjoining neighbours to the west benefit from a single storey extension of similar depth to the one proposed at the appeal property. The two storey extension would be sited away from the boundary between the two properties and I am satisfied that the living conditions of these neighbours would not be harmed as a result of the proposal, with particular regard to outlook.
12. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed extensions would not materially harm the living conditions of the nearby neighbours, with particular regard to loss of outlook. There would be no conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Core Strategy and the Framework, and in particular paragraph 135 f) all of which, amongst other things, seek for development to respect the amenities of existing and future occupiers.
13. The Council's second reason for refusal also refers to an overbearing impact and increased sense of enclosure on the application site itself. The basis for this concern is not articulated by the Council. However, given the siting of the two storey development partly to the side of the property and with appropriate garden space remaining, I do not consider that the amenities of the residents of the appeal site would be adversely impacted by the proposed development. There would be no conflict with the development plan policies already referenced.

Conditions

14. In terms of conditions, the materials should accord with those set out on the approved plans and the application forms to respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area, and the approved plans should be listed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of good planning. I shall also add a condition to require compliance with the submitted Fire Strategy in the interests of fire safety.

Conclusion

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

L J Evans

INSPECTOR