



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/25/3374623

33 Hardman Road, Kingston upon Thames, KT2 6RH

- 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 C Paderi against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 25/01347/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a loft hip to gable and dormer extension including raising parapet wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a loft hip to gable and dormer extension including raising parapet wall at 33 Hardman Road, Kingston upon Thames, KT2 6RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01347/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250 and Drg Nos A0101, A0102, A0103, A0104, A0105, A0106, A0107, A0108, A0109, A0110, A0111, A0112, A0113 and A0114.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The works shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the Fire Statement prepared by Architecture Everything dated 2024.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to one half of a modest semi-detached pair of two-storey dwellings with a hipped roof including a central parapet wall. The property is on the north side of Hardman Road, a short residential street comprising mostly semi-detached pairs similar in form and age to the appeal property, with some occasional alternative forms interspersed. The proposal is for a hip to gable change

to the roof including a rear dormer extension. This would involve a marginal increase to the height of the dwelling's ridge. The proposal would effectively create a dwelling with a front roof slope leading to a flat crown with the perception of a three-storey elevation to the rear.

4. When dealing with roof extensions, the Council's *Residential Design Guide SPD*, adopted in 2013, advises that dormer windows should be designed to complement the character of the existing house and be set down from the ridge and in from the sides and eaves of the property. With respect to gable ends, it advises that proposals to extend a hipped roof to a gable are not usually appropriate as they are often at odds with the existing character of a property. In this case the combined form of the gable end extension and rear dormer would dominate the dwelling's existing roof scape and would appear at odds with its simple and traditional architectural composition. In this regard the proposal would represent a type of development the SPD advises against.
5. However, during my visit I was struck by the number of roof alterations that were equivalent in form to the appeal proposal. Many of these have been brought to my attention by the appellant. Within a continuous row of twenty matching dwellings (10 semi-detached pairs), out of twenty-five houses in total on the south side of Hardman Road, I counted seventeen properties with hip to gable changes, most with obvious rear dormers constructed flush with the dwelling's side wall. Amongst a similar group of dwellings, I counted five further equivalent roof alterations on the north side of the road. In a number of instances, the changes had occurred to only one property out of the pair, creating a visual imbalance. It was evident to me that the development pattern along Hardman Road had evolved over time and that side gabled roofs including rear dormers were prominent features within the now established character of the area and street scene.
6. I recognise that many of the alterations have been undertaken as permitted development under the provisions of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, but not exclusively so, as demonstrated by the appellant. Planning permission was granted in 2023 for development at 12 Hardman Road (Ref 23/02718/HOU) which included a hip to gable and rear dormer roof extension with two front roof lights. I have been provided with a set of the approved plans and note the scale and form of the approved scheme resembles closely that proposed at No 33. The officer's report for the scheme at No 12 noted that, whilst the proposal did not fully follow the guiding principles of the *Residential Design SPD*, the context of the site and surroundings meant that, on balance, the proposed extensions were acceptable.
7. In this instance, notwithstanding the obvious conflict with the SPD, the proposed alterations to No 33 would directly reflect a very prominent style of roof form that has evolved within the area and which is commonplace. The imbalance with the attached property at No 31 would not be atypical. Neither would the marginally raised ridge height, which would be barely perceived. Given this context, I find the proposal would be neither overly dominant nor incongruous within its setting. As such, there would be no harm to the established character or appearance of the street scene or wider area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 or Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 as far as they both seek to ensure development displays a quality of design that respects and responds positively to the local character and distinctiveness of the area.

Conditions

8. In the event of the appeal succeeding the Council has suggested four conditions. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A further condition is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in materials to match the existing in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. I have also included a condition requiring the development to be carried out and maintained in accordance with the submitted Fire Statement in the interests of safety.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR