
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3367465

10 Mayberry Place, Surbiton, KT5 8SY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs T Shaban against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
 - The application Reference is 25/00327/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of hip to gable and rear dormer roof extension with installation of 2nos. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace two-storey hipped-roof cottage of simple and attractive proportions and façade. It is part of a grouping of almost uniform late 19th Century, 2 storey terraces of artisan cottages, with small front gardens. Beyond this the wider residential area has a mix of differing and mainly attractive properties. Local houses and green space results in a very pleasing established character and a most attractive ambiance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The site lies within the Fishponds Park Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Policy HC1 of the London Plan (LP) and Policy DM 12 of the Core Strategy (2012) (CS) enlarge and reflect this. LP Policy D3 and CS Policies CS 8 and DM 10 are also all relevant to the case. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure development which would be of a high design standard, complement the architectural nature of the original building, respect local roof forms, reflect local distinctiveness, and protect or enhance context and character. The aims of the Council's Residential Design SPD 2013 (SPD) mirror these policy objectives albeit I do recognise that this document cannot be expected to cover every eventuality.
-

5. The Appellant puts the case that gables are the dominant feature locally. However, I am in no doubt, notwithstanding one or two exceptions, that hipped roof ends on the cluster of comparable terraces are a key defining feature in this immediate locality. To my mind it is a strong visual attribute and should be protected. Unfortunately, the planned gable end would markedly interfere with the consistency and rhythm of the roofs. Whilst, as the Appellant points out, there would be no prominence from Fish Ponds Park, the appeal proposal would be readily seen in the attractive local streetscene and be visually harmful.
6. Furthermore, the rear dormer arrangement would appear as too large a form. There would be limited semblance of sympathetic design, bear little relation or proportionality to what lies below and, on this property, would lead to a jumbled and unattractively awkward arrangement at this upper level. Notwithstanding that the rear dormer would not be open to wide public vantage points it is particularly important to secure good appropriate design in a Conservation Area context such as this.
7. In summary, the roof changes would be excessive and incongruous in relation to this house and the character of the location; there would be adverse impingement upon the aesthetic qualities of this home and the wider area.
8. Given the foregoing I conclude that the change proposed would be contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) and would conflict with the development plan policies and the SPD which I cite in paragraph 4 above. The appeal scheme would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host property or the wider area.

Other matters

9. I understand the Appellant's wish to increase the extent of accommodation at this property, and I agree that the scheme would not detract from residential amenity for neighbours. I can see that some thought has been given to window type and the selection of external finishes. A number of alterations to dwellings have been drawn to my attention. However, they are different in nature to the scheme before me given form, location and scale and I would not hold that all these as extensions should set a design benchmark for this part of the Conservation Area. In any event I must assess this case on its own merits and my reasoning is set out above.
10. I was sorry to read that the Appellant was disappointed with the Council's handling of the submitted plans and also the content of the Officer's Report. That debate is not within my remit; I have looked at all matters afresh.
11. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant, but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
12. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of

the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore, there are no other benefits, including to the Appellant, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

Overall conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR