



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2025 by S Indermaur BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3360631

113 Acre Road, Kingstone Upon Thames KT2 6EZ

- 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 Georgios Stratos against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 24/02788/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension to a semi-detached residential house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property forms half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings with a shared gable roof and gabled outrigger, creating an overall uniform appearance which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal dwelling has an existing single storey infill rear extension with a shallow single aspect roof. The host property possesses a modest sized garden with low level boundary fences.
5. Policy Guidance 34 outlines within the Residential Design SPD (2013) that for a two-storey rear extension, flat roofs should generally be avoided unless it is a feature of the existing building. In this case, the existing building does not feature a flat roof. Moreover, whilst the proposal would not extend beyond the rear building line, the combination of the height, width and shape of the proposal would not be subordinate to or respect the pitched outrigger. The development would introduce an incongruous addition, which in turn would unbalance the shared outrigger and cause a loss of symmetry, between the pair of properties.
6. The proposal would largely be viewed only at an oblique angle from the street scene, although the development would still be visible from neighbouring

properties. Despite the lack of visibility from the public realm, the proposal would still need to respect the prevailing character and appearance of the original dwelling and neighbouring dwellings.

7. I note that existing properties within the local area possess a variety of architectural styles, although there are a number of properties in the immediate vicinity that share a pitched outrigger. In addition, while flat roof forms are exhibited on some nearby buildings and some dwellings have had full width two storey extensions, these have not generally involved a loss of symmetry with regards to changing the pitch of an outrigger and thus have not caused the loss of a positive design feature.
8. The appellant has made reference to an allowed appeal¹ for a nearby development incorporating rear extensions at No. 121 Acre Road, dated 22 September 2022. Although this development included a first-floor flat roof extension, I am mindful that the referenced property does not share an outrigger or gable roof with the neighbouring dwelling and as such there would not be the same loss of symmetry. Furthermore, the proposal would be tucked in alongside the rear elevation of a neighbouring property, which to some extent would reduce the visual prominence. Collectively, these factors distinguish the referenced appeal from the current proposal, and I have not therefore given any significant weight to this matter in my decision making.
9. An approved planning application for a rear infill extension that involved building up to the ridgeline of the main roof, causing the loss of an outrigger, was also referred to by the appellant. Whilst this property and one of its neighbours had a similar existing form and scale to the rear, these dwellings were not attached and therefore had a different interrelationship. Moreover, the proposal is visually distinct to the appeal proposal as it does not include a flat roofed element. Therefore, this development does not present the necessary justification to allow the development as proposed.
10. I accept that the proposed materials would relate well to the host building, but for the reasons outlined above, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. In this regard, the proposal would conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Core Strategy (2012) and Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), as well the aforementioned Residential Design SPD. Together, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that new development recognises and relates to distinctive local character with regards to scale, height, roof form, appearance and shape.

Other Matter

11. Concerns over the handling of the application in terms of assessment within the report are noted, however these are matters are not determinative in the assessment of the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

¹ APP/Z5630/D/22/3300992

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR