

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2025

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 02 December 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3373350**

**11 West Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 7HA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs David and Sophie Mitchell against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
  - The application Reference is 25/01422/HOU.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front, rear and side extension, conversion of an existing garage into a habitable space with extension; roof extension with 1no side and 1no rear dormers; installation of 1no rear and 1no side rooflights; and remodel of existing dwelling.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey front, rear and side extension, conversion of an existing garage into a habitable space with extension; roof extension with 1no side and 1no rear dormers; installation of 1no rear and 1no side rooflights; and remodel of existing dwelling at 11 West Road, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 7HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01422/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 the following approved plans: 153 RevA; 195 RevA; 350 RevA; 351 RevB; 110 RevB; 111 RevB; 150 RevA; 151 RevA; and 152 RevA.
    3. The development to which this permission relates shall be carried out in accordance with Arboricultural Assessment and Statement dated 23 May 2025. The approved measures shall be implemented prior to commencement of any work on site and maintained to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority until the completion of the development.
    4. Prior to the commencement of any above-ground works, a landscape & planting plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include, where appropriate, a clear key or legend corresponding to the landscaping plan and providing the following information:
      - Replanting of lost trees on a ratio of 2 trees planted for each tree lost
-

- Species (both Latin & Common names) for all plants.
- Locations of all plants or areas of planting.
- Plant numbers or planting densities.
- Sizes of all plants and particularly trees 'at time of planting'.
- Details of all hard-landscaping areas including materials

The approved scheme shall then be implemented within the first planting season following substantial completion of the development. The tree planting and landscaping shall thereafter be maintained for five years to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Any trees or shrubs which die during this period shall be replaced at the beginning of the following planting season, and the areas shown to be landscaped shall be permanently retained for that purpose.

5. The flat roof areas of the development to which this permission relates shall not be used as a roof garden, balcony, seating area or other similar amenity area, and shall not be accessed except for the purpose of maintenance or in the case of emergency.
6. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the deposited Fire Strategy.

### **Main Issue**

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

### **Reasons**

#### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is a well-proportioned two-storey traditional detached dwelling with a generous hipped roof, statement chimney and agreeable elevations and fenestration. The immediate and wider residential area with its mix of substantial properties and gardens and green spaces has a pleasing established character and attractive ambiance. The appeal site is within the Drive Local Area of Special Character and Strategic Area of Special Character of Kingston Hill/Coombe Hill, which is a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal is as described above.
4. For the cogent reasons in the Officer Report, I would agree that dormers, materials' changes, the front stone structure and the southern side extension would all represent acceptable development.
5. The Council is concerned that the northern side extension would protrude beyond, and wrap around in front of, part of the main front elevation up to first floor cill height across the gable element at this end of the house. This would effectively be a blank wall and has been assessed by the Council as over-sized, unduly dominant, and an inappropriate design for this immediate and wider context.
6. To my eye, whilst this is an unusual approach, I can appreciate that it is an effective way to achieve the accommodation sought and would add a degree of modern design idiom. I would assess that this an aesthetically reasonable way

to extend the home on this corner and that the works will appear subordinate. Surroundings are largely traditional but touches of modern architecture are evident and, in this instance, the original home would continue to be the most visually dominant factor. As it happens, unless there are radical changes to on and off-site landscape, the works in question would not in any event be visible from the public realm.

7. In all the circumstances the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of this property and its locality; the scheme would not represent inappropriate design for this context. There would be no harm or loss to the non-designated heritage asset.
8. Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, CS8 and DM10 and DM12 of the Council's adopted LDF Core Strategy April are relevant. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek well designed development, protective of heritage assets and their environmental context, appropriate to a site and its setting and of a suitable scale, appearance and character which would protect local distinctiveness. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies.

#### *Conditions*

9. The scheme should have the standard commencement condition. The Council suggests the requirement for intended external materials to be submitted but I see no need for this given the details within the application. I agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty. For reasons of safety, I would also agree that a condition relating to the Fire Safety Strategy is applied. I concur that residential amenity for neighbours should be protected by restrictions on the use of the flat roof areas. I would also agree that tree felling and protection and new landscape should be addressed in the interests of visual amenity.

#### *Overall conclusion*

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR