



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2025

by **N Perrins MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3366503

79 Mayfair Avenue, Worcester Park KT4 7SJ

- 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 and Mrs Sharma against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/03006/HOU.
 - The development proposed is erection of part hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions with installation of 3 Nos. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of part hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions with installation of 3 Nos. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion at 79 Mayfair Avenue, Worcester Park KT4 7SJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/03006/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: (i) Location Plan, (ii) Block Plan, (iii) Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations Drg. No. CO/S/02 Rev A, and (iv) Proposed Roof Plan Drg. No. CO/2/04.
 - 3) The external facing materials used in the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority.
 - 4) The development must be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Fire Safety Statement submitted with the application and thereafter maintained.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the header above I have used the description of development set out on the Council's decision notice as it more accurately reflects the proposal before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey house, which has been extended in the past with front and rear additions. The character of Mayfair Avenue is residential made up of predominately semi-detached dwellings. Many properties in the area have altered their roof structures and profiles with extensions and other changes. This has created a varied and interesting roofscape character with many different styles evident. This includes installation of rear dormers some of which can be seen from public vantage points.
5. The appeal proposal would raise the roof with a part hip to gable extension, which would facilitate the erection of a rear dormer and conversion of the loft to living space. Three rooflights would be installed on the front section of the roof. There is no dispute between the parties over the proposed infill section to the side and the rooflights. I agree that these aspects would not appear out of keeping with what is a very varied roofscape in the area in and around the site. The sole matter in dispute is whether the proposed rear dormer would be unacceptably out of character with the host property and wider area due to its size and form.
6. Policy DM10 of the Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2012 (CS) requires development to incorporate the principles of good design. The policy also lists a series of essential elements that are identified as contributing to the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area which should be respected, maintained or enhanced. These include scale, layout, height, form including roof forms and massing. Reference is also made to further guidance being set out in the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) adopted in 2013.
7. Although the dormer would increase the property's roof-level bulk and mass to the rear, its positioning below the modified ridge and setting in from the adjoining property's roof ensures that it would appear as appropriately scaled in relation to the remainder of the dwelling. The property has also already undergone alterations to the roof and lower floors, which have changed and denuded the original dwelling's symmetry. In this context, the proposed dormer design would not be unacceptably out of keeping with the evolved appearance of the roof and lower floors and would appear as a proportionate and appropriately designed addition. Furthermore, the use of matching external materials as proposed will ensure that the dormer integrates successfully with the architectural style of the host property.
8. I have also had regard to Policy Guidance 39 of the SPD, which seeks to ensure dormers compliment the original design of the house and do not dominate the form of the existing roof. The proposed dormer would not meet all the guidance listed, most notably in terms of distance to its ridge and sides. However, as explained above it would still be set within the altered roof form sitting below the ridge line and would appear proportionate in size and scale to the rest of the building. Consequently, the dormer would not constitute an excessively dominant feature. Its design, scale and form would also achieve notably significantly greater compatibility with the host property than several nearby examples. Even though the specific details of these other examples are not before me they are in situ and form part of the character of the area. Thus, and when considering all relevant matters, the minor non-compliances with the SPD guidance do not warrant refusal of planning permission when considering the site-specific context in this case.

9. Additionally, there are several examples in the wider surrounding area of rear dormers that are markedly visible and prominent in the street scene due to road layouts and curvature. In contrast with this, and due to the appeal site's position on the road, only the side of the rear dormer would be marginally visible from public vantage points. Accordingly, the dormer would not appear as an incongruous or irregular feature in the street scene when considering the prevailing varied roof scape pattern of development in the area.
10. In conclusion and for the reasons stated, the appeal proposal would not unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and accords with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy DM10 of the CS, which requires development to respect, maintain or enhance character and local distinctiveness.

Other matters

11. I am aware that representations were made to the planning application regarding potential construction impacts of the proposal to one of the neighbouring properties. The matters raised are, however, best controlled by other provisions such as building regulations and not a matter for me to consider in this appeal.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested several conditions, which I have considered having regard to paragraph 57 of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. For reasons of clarity, conditions are necessary to impose the standard time limit for implementation and to ensure the appeal scheme is erected in accordance with the approved drawings. I also agree with the Council that a condition is necessary to ensure the external materials should match those of the host property to maintain the character of the area.
13. Finally, a condition for the development to comply with the submitted Fire Management Strategy is necessary to accord with the safety measures set out in Policy D12 of the London Plan 2021.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and considering all matters raised, I conclude that the development accords with the development plan and the appeal is allowed.

N Perrins

INSPECTOR