



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2025 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3366912

8 Purbeck Avenue, New Malden, Kingston Upon Thames KT3 6RW

- 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 Kapil Khanna against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 25/00706/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the “erection of single-storey rear extension, two storey side and first floor rear extensions”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of single-storey rear extension, two storey side and first floor rear extensions at 8 Purbeck Avenue, New Malden, Kingston Upon Thames KT3 6RW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00706/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers: 01A, 11A, 101A, 102A, 103A, 111A, 112A, 121A.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Fire Safety Statement dated 12.03.2025.

Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matters and Main Issues

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. However, I am satisfied that the original description accurately describes the appeal development and is therefore reflected above. The main issues in regard to which are its effect on a) the character and appearance of the area and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 6 Purbeck Avenue (No 6) with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is a link detached property which appears to be relatively unaltered from the front elevation. Purbeck Avenue is a short road with the buildings on one side of the street. The properties are similar in their attachment and consistent in their materials and general outward appearance, with hipped roofs and side dormer

windows sat into a roof line that slopes to the ground floor. The position and size of the dormers gives some variation to roof profiles, and it is not uncommon to see some extensions in the street scene. The Council does not object to the single storey and first storey rear element of the proposal. I have no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the two-storey side extension.

4. The proposal would clearly be subordinate in height and would harmonise with the existing dwelling's roof shape and the consistency of the wider street in this regard. The step back from the front would retain the original roof slope to the street facing elevation and respect the dwelling's design. Its use of materials and finishes would further aid the visual integration of the extension. Whilst there would be some blank elevation, this would be to the side which would have a very limited influence on the street scene due to the proximity of building pairs to each other.
5. Given this and the above, the proposal would not detrimentally change the building to result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would thus comply with Policies D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD) which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Living Conditions

6. The proposal would abut the boundary of No 6 with a separation gap maintained by the existing side driveway of No 6 and the pathway beside the existing building. It would present as a two-storey projection which would face the side windows of the building and with a modest step down to the single storey rear element. This stepped design would ensure that the rear windows would be otherwise unobstructed and would have minimal impact to the occupiers in terms of the long outwards views. While the side windows of No. 6 would face some blank elevation, its effect would be minimal given the separation distance and the size of the windows. The relationship experienced would not be significantly different to others in respect of groups of close-knit detached properties. I am satisfied that the occupiers of the properties would not experience an unacceptable loss of outlook.
7. Moreover, and due to the long plot, spacious gardens and existing garage building within No 6, the garden would be otherwise unincumbered in its rear aspect and would not result in an adverse sense of enclosure nor unacceptable harm to the outlook within the garden. Resultantly, it would comply with Policies CS8, DM10 and DM12 of the CS, the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the living conditions of the occupiers of properties are protected.

Other Matter

8. Concerns have been raised by neighbours surrounding living conditions with particular regard to overlooking and loss of light. The Council have not raised this as a reason for refusal; therefore, I have not considered the matter further.

Conditions

9. The standard time limit condition and reference to the approved plans is necessary for enforcement purposes. Moreover, as the plans make reference to the materials

to be used, and I have deemed it unnecessary to require a condition securing them. I have set out a condition securing the fire safety statement given the requirements of the development plan in this regard.

10. The Council have recommended a number of conditions which include a flat roof standard condition. I have no further details on this and therefore cannot adequately consider it meets the required tests for conditions. The use of any flat roof as a balcony or raised platform would require a separate planning permission. The plans detail that all windows in the side elevation will be obscurely glazed and top opening, an additional condition to secure such is not therefore required. The condition requesting swift bricks provides no evidence to support why it is necessary for a scheme of this type. It has therefore not been applied. I have not considered any other conditions are necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I have no reason to recommend other than that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR