



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 September 2025

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3369487

149 Church Lane, Chessington, KT9 2DR

- 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 Herrington against the decision of the Council to the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 25/01006/HOU.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of first floor side extension and changes to rear fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a mixed suburban area which includes a broad range of dwellings of different sizes, styles and designs. Typically, the buildings are set in from their side boundaries and back from the street. This, together with the soft planting within and around the front gardens contributes to the spacious suburban character and appearance of the street scene.
4. The appeal dwelling is one of a pair of uniformly designed modern detached two storey houses with gable roofs to the front and rear. There is a modest sized gap between the two dwellings, which provides pedestrian access to the rear garden of the appeal property. On the opposite side of the appeal dwelling is an irregular shaped single storey flat roofed extension with a false pitch facing the highway. It projects up to the boundary with the adjacent dwelling, which comprises a detached bungalow with a fully hipped roof.
5. Together and amongst other things Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 (The London Plan) and Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2012 (CS), seek to ensure that new development is designed to a high standard, relates well to its surroundings and respects, maintains or enhances local character and distinctiveness. This includes key features such as roof forms, windows, design detailing and materials.

6. In relation to two storey side extensions the Kingston Upon Thames Residential Design (SPD) is consistent with these policies. Amongst other things it advises that two storey side extensions should be designed to be in harmony with the appearance and character of the area. They should be subordinate to the main house; roofs and fenestration should reflect and relate well to that of the main house; the eaves line should run with that of the original dwelling; and avoid a terracing effect.
7. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would be set back from the front building line and down from the main ridge line of the host dwelling. Due to the modest height and distance between the appeal dwelling and the front projection of the adjacent dwelling, the proposed extension would not result in a terracing effect within the street scene. Also, the extension would be constructed from the same palette of materials as the existing house. In these respects, the proposal would comply with the above policies and advice.
8. However, the proposed ground floor window and door would not respect the existing fenestration and the expanse of render above the proposed door and window would appear too high and out of alignment with the render on the ground floor of the existing dwelling. The first floor element of the proposed extension would have a shallow false hip and the first floor window would be both shallow and out of alignment with the existing first floor front windows. The small area of flat roof at ground floor level would be irregular in shape and its relationship to the resultant side extension would appear awkward. As a result, the proposed front elevation would appear poorly proportioned and would materially detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.
9. To the side and rear the flat roof of the proposed first floor extension would sit above the eaves line of the host dwelling and the proposed rear windows would be out of keeping with the proportions and appearance of the existing windows. For these reasons the side and rear elevations of the proposed extension would be visually utilitarian and unattractive. They would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its setting.
10. Overall, due to the width and height of the front ground floor element and the height of the flat roof over the first floor, the proposed extension would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The resultant side extension would appear stark, poorly proportioned, and out of keeping with the host dwelling. This harm would clearly outweigh the benefits for the appellant and their family that would result from the additional accommodation and is not something that could be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions.
11. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan and CS Policies CS8 & DM10.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR