



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 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: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3368656

4 Warren Road, Kingston Upon Thames KT2 7HN

- 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 Nigel Kerr against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 25/00019/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as “we would like to install a glass safety barrier (15mm thick 1100mm height) around the edge of the flat roof at the first and second floor levels of our house”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for Installation a glass safety barrier around the edge of the flat roof at the first and second floor levels at 4 Warren Road, Kingston Upon Thames KT2 7HN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00019/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: PP-13672237v1, 11-01, 06-01, 16-01, P1240-05, P1238-05

Appeal Procedure

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.

Preliminary Matters & Main Issue

3. I have used the description from the application form but omitted the additional explanatory text for clarity as to what development the appeal relates. This has not altered any part of the appeal scheme nor prejudiced the ability of any of the main parties to make their case in respect thereof.
4. The appeal proposal seeks planning permission for a glass safety barrier around the upper floors. Notwithstanding the comments made by the main parties, the use of the space as a balcony would be a separate matter to what has been applied for. Moreover, should the flat roof area be used as a balcony it would require planning permission. In any event, the application form and description explicitly state it is for the glass barrier and not a balcony, as well as there being a controlling condition on the original building permission to restrict its use. I have therefore considered the

appeal solely as a glass safety barrier. The main issue in which is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a detached property which was rebuilt to the building in place today. It is contemporary in form, scaling, detail and materials with a flat roof. The street scene consists of large, detached dwellings in varying designs and scales on a private verdant road. These features in combination contribute to a pleasant variety along the street which has a positive effect on the area.
6. The appeal property stands on its own in terms of its design and form. By way of the modern flat roof appearance of the dwelling, the proposal would not be seen as being overly large or bulky and would complement its design. Moreover, as it would sit on the upper levels and by nature of its translucent material it would blend seamlessly against the building. Whilst it is uncommon to have a flat roof and glass barrier element in the locale, as there is a varied street scene with buildings of different forms and ages, this modest addition would sit comfortably with its context.
7. The proposal would not therefore detrimentally change the building to result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would thus comply with Policy DM10 of the Kingston Core Strategy 2012, the Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document 2013 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Conditions

8. The time limit condition and reference to the approved plans are required for enforcement purposes. As the glass barrier has been demonstrated on the plans and these are to be secured by condition, I have not deemed a materials condition necessary. The Council have recommended a condition to limit access to the roof by virtue of the glass barrier. However, this would not be necessary since a separate permission would be required to use it as a balcony. I have not considered any other conditions to be relevant or reasonable.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. I therefore recommend it be allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. 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