



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C.** Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3364265

10 Clarence Avenue, New Malden KT3 3ED

- 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 George Tillekeratne against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames.
 - The application ref. is 24/02728/HOU.
 - The development proposed is raising the roof height and erection of a rear dormer extension with installation of 3 front rooflights to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding terrace of dwellings and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a three-bedroomed two storey home located on the south side of Clarence Avenue in New Malden. It is a mid-terrace property which is in a row of four dwellings, with no.8 Clarence Avenue to the immediate west of the appeal site and nos 12 and 14 to the east. No.14 has a two-storey side extension and off-road parking. No.8 has a two-storey rear extension and there are rear dormers on homes in the immediate area.
4. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature, with a mix of two storey detached, semi-detached and terrace properties of similar and varying architectural designs.
5. The proposal seeks to raise the ridgeline of the roof of no.10 and insert 3 velux top hung rooflights in the front roof slope. The roof tiles would be new and of a type and colour matching the existing tiles. At the rear of the roof there would be a flat roofed dormer structure which would be the full width of the roof slope. It would have two windows and would be tile hung on its rear face. The existing chimney stack at the west end of the appeal site's roof is noted as being demolished.
6. Whilst the proposed increase in the roof ridge would be relatively modest, the proposal would appear prominent given its mid-terrace location. Notwithstanding that there have been various extensions to Nos 8 – 14 (even), the dwellings are readily perceived from the front as a terrace of dwellings with side hips on the main

- roof. The increase in height of the appeal site's ridgeline would be incongruous and would harm the visual amenity of the host dwelling and the terrace in which it sits.
7. The proposed new roof would look particularly poorly designed at its east end where it would drop to the existing terrace's main ridgeline and the proposed front roof lights would also draw attention to that particular lack of uniformity.
 8. There are no planning appeals before me to raise the ridgelines of any other of the homes in the terrace and so I can give only negligible weight to the expressed desire of a neighbour to the appeal site to undertake a similar development to the one proposed.
 9. My site visit confirmed that there were a number of locations within the immediate streetscene where the proposed development would be visible and be perceived as harming the cohesiveness of the terrace.
 10. I have considerable sympathy with the need of the current occupants of the appeal site to increase their living accommodation and I appreciate that the roof raising is proposed so that sufficient headroom could be achieved to meet building regulations. I also bear in mind extensions in the area drawn to my attention by the appellant, but I do not find them sufficiently persuasive to allow this proposed mid-terrace roof raising. Other considerations such as the economic benefits flowing from construction works and the avoidance of reducing the rear garden space have been borne in mind. However, overall, the benefits of the proposal are clearly outweighed by tangible harm to the host dwelling, the terrace and the streetscene.
 11. In summary, I find that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of properties in which it sits and the wider streetscene. It would be contrary to policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and policies CS8 and DM10 of Kingston's LDF Core Strategy (adopted 2012).

Conclusion

12. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector