

- **18/16829/PNH - Date of Decision: 10th January 2019**

LOCATION: 21 BERRYLANDS, SURBITON, KT5 8JT

PROPOSAL: Erection of single storey rear extension (5.4m in depth, maximum height of 3.5m and eaves height of 2.9m)

The proposed rear extension would not fall within the parameters of permitted development as set out under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph (j) (iii) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as parts of the proposed extension would extend beyond original side walls and **would have a width which is greater than half the width of the original dwelling house.**

- **18/12854/FUL – Date of Decision: 10 January 2019**

LOCATION: Flat 1a, 137 Richmond Road, Kingston upon Thames, KT2 5BZ

PROPOSAL: Erection of two storey rear extension to enlarge existing flat to create a 2 bedroom, 4 person flat

The proposed development, **due to its bulk, scale and design, would harm the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.** The development therefore conflicts with Policy DM10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2012) and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (2016) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document titled 'Residential Design' (2013).

The proposed development, **due to its bulk, scale and design, would harm the amenities of surrounding residents in terms of loss of light, outlook, privacy and overshadowing.** The development therefore conflicts with Policy DM10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2012) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document titled 'Residential Design' (2013).

The proposed development would not provide satisfactory standards of accommodation for its intended occupants, in conflict with Policies DM10 and DM13 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2012) and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2016) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document titled 'Residential Design' (2013).

The proposed development would adversely impact upon parking access and provision, thereby increasing parking pressures and harming highway safety. The development is therefore contrary to Policies DM09 and DM10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2012) and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (2016) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document titled 'Sustainable Transport' (2013).

- **18/14945/HOU Date of Decision: 11 January 2019**

LOCATION: 89 Beverley Way, New Malden, SW20 0AW

PROPOSAL: Erection of two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension.

The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its excessive width, siting and close proximity to the shared boundary at first floor level, would diminish the characteristic gap between the application site and the neighbouring property, giving rise to a visual terracing effect, which would be exacerbated if the adjoining neighbour were to replicate this proposal. **This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene, conflicting with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy (2012) and the Council's Residential Design SPD (2013).**

The proposed two storey rear extension, by reason of its design, **would be an incongruous addition that would be visually intrusive from the private views of the site from neighbouring properties in Beverley Way.**

This would be **harmful to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the visual amenities of the surrounding area, in conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy (2012) and the Council's Residential Design SPD (2013).**

- **18/15049/FUL Date of Decision: 11 January 2019**

LOCATION: 246 Kingston Road, New Malden, KT3 3RN

PROPOSAL: Erection of hip to gable and rear dormer roof extensions and installation of 2 x rooflights to create 1 x 1 bed and 1 x bedsit/studio flats.

The proposed two storey side extension, by reason of its excessive width, siting and close proximity to the shared boundary at first floor level, would diminish the characteristic gap between the application site and the neighbouring property, giving rise to a visual terracing effect, which would be exacerbated if the adjoining neighbour were to replicate this proposal. **This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene, conflicting with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy (2012) and the Council's Residential Design SPD (2013).**

The proposed two storey rear extension, by reason of its design, **would be an incongruous addition that would be visually intrusive from the private views of the site from neighbouring properties in Beverley Way. This would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the visual amenities of the surrounding area, in conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy (2012) and the Council's Residential Design SPD (2013).**

- **18/15018/HOU Date of Decision: 14 January 2019**

LOCATION: 31 Henley Drive, Kingston Upon Thames, KT2 7EB

PROPOSAL: Erection of first floor rear flat roof structure

The proposed first floor rear structure, by reason of its design (including materials), would be a dominant and incongruous addition that would be visually intrusive from the private views of the site from neighbouring properties in Henley Drive. This would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding Kingston Hill/Coombe Hill Strategic **Area of Special Character**, in conflict with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy (2012) and the Council's Residential Design SPD (2013)

- **19/02630/HOU**

LOCATION: 131 Compton Crescent Chessington KT9 2HG

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side & single storey rear extension, rear dormer roof extension, garage upgrade, front porch extension, loft conversion and associated alterations to fenestration.

The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its poor design which includes; the absence of a 0.5m dropped roofline and a proposed width which is greater than 50% of the width of the main dwelling; would be a disproportionate addition which would appear as a visually incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would be at odds with the streetscene of Compton Crescent. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (Adopted April 2012), and the Residential Design SPD (Adopted July 2013).

The proposed rear dormer roof extension by reason of its detailed design which includes: the absence of a sufficient set down from the ridge of the main dwelling; and its overall bulk; would fail to appear proportionate or subordinate to the original property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (Adopted April 2012) and the Residential Design SPD (Adopted July 2013).

The proposed rear decking by virtue of its positioning and height; would prejudice the neighbouring amenities of the neighbouring dwelling, no.129 Compton Crescent by way of **overlooking into their rear garden** which would represent a **detrimental loss of privacy**. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (Adopted April 2012) and the Residential Design SPD (Adopted July 2013).

19/02989/CPU Date of decision: 23rd December 2019

LOCATION: to rear At Junipers Coombe Hill Road Kingston Upon Thames KT2 7DU

PROPOSAL: Erection of single storey conservatory

The proposed extension is not considered to fall within the parameters of permitted development as set out under schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Planning permission 99/06120 condition 9 states: Notwithstanding the provision of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order, 1995 (or any other Order revoking or re-enacting this Order) no extensions (including porches or dormer windows) to the dwelling house or buildings shall be erected within the curtilage.

Reason: **To safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining occupiers, maintain adequate amenity space** and safeguard the cohesive appearance of the development.

19/02264/FUL Date of decision: 12th December 2019

LOCATION: 15 Lime Grove New Malden KT3 3TW

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing building and erection of 6 no. flats and 5 no. houses with associated parking.

The proposed resultant development, by reason of its **excessive residential density, scale, and size would result in an over-intensive form of development.**

The proposed development would be cramped in appearance and represent a stark contrast to its surrounding suburban context, in terms of siting, height and design.

The proposal would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies 3.4, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (as amended in 2016), Policies CS8, CS10 and DM10 of the adopted Core Strategy (2012), and Policy Guidance 24 and 27 of the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2013).

The proposed gates to the front of the site would be out of character with the neighbouring residential properties on the surrounding streetscape on Lime Grove. Moreover, the proposed gates would effectively create a gated community which would prevent social permeability contrary to the aims of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policy 3.5 of the London (as amended in 2016), Policy CS14 of the adopted Core Strategy (2012).

The proposal would harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers at number 13 Lime Grove and numbers 17 and 17A Lime Grove, in terms of outlook, privacy, overlooking and overbearing impact. Also, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed Parklift system would not result in unacceptable noise and disturbance for neighbouring occupiers. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to paragraph 170 of the NPPF, Policies 7.6 and 7.15 of the London Plan, and Policy DM10 of the adopted Core Strategy (2012).

The cumulative impact of the failure to the limited outdoor space, poor outlook and lack of privacy is such that the proposed development would not provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future residents. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (as amended in 2016), Policies DM10 and part A of

DM13 of the adopted Core Strategy (2012), and Policy Guidance 13 and 14 Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2013).

Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in unacceptable parking stress and lead to additional congestion as drivers seek a parking space, or park illegally. The proposed parking arrangements, and absence of a unilateral agreement to secure the car club and city car schemes, would have a harmful effect on highway safety in the area. The proposal would fail to comply with Paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (as amended in 2016) and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Core Strategy (2013).

19/01962/FUL Date of decision: 18th October 2019

LOCATION: Charter Court Linden Grove, New Malden, KT3 3BN

PROPOSAL: Demolition of 13 no. existing garages and erection of 4no. detached dwellings with 4no. parking spaces and associated communal landscaping to be added to the existing Charter Court development.

The development has failed to incorporate a mix of unit sizes and types to meet the identified housing needs of the Borough. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the delivery of 30% of the units as family units would be unsuitable or unviable. As such, the development is contrary to Policy DM13 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012.

The proposed development would be poor quality and of an unacceptable design due to its incongruous and cramped appearance. The proposed development would also fail to clearly define public and private space which would lead to a poor relationship with the existing buildings on site and amongst those proposed, thereby conflicting with Paragraph 124 of the NPPF, 2019, policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan, 2016, policies CS8, DM10 and DM11 of the Core Strategy, 2012 and the Residential Design SPD, 2013.

The proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the residential amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of outdoor amenity space, privacy and visual intrusion regarding No. 4 Fairacre due to the proximity of the proposed first floor terraces of Plots 2, 3 and 4, thereby conflicting with Paragraph 127 of the NPPF, 2019 and Policy DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012 and the Council's Residential Design SPD, 2013.

The proposed loss of 13 garages would have an unacceptable adverse impact upon existing car parking provision for the residents of Charter Court resulting in adverse impacts upon traffic congestion, on-street car parking pressure on surrounding roads and vehicular and pedestrian safety in the area, thereby conflicting with conflict with Policies DM9 and DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy, 2012.

19/01646/FUL Date of Decision: 30th September 2019

LOCATION: 5 Cotsford Avenue, New Malden, KT3 5EU

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing 1.5 storey, 4 bedroom dwelling house, garage and outbuildings and the erection of a new 2 storey, 4 bedroom dwelling house with an attached garage and utility room.

The proposed dwelling house **by reason of its size and design would appear out of character** within the street scene of Cotsford Avenue. Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the LDF Core Strategy adopted April 2012.

The **proposed dwelling house by reason of its location, height and rearward projection would have an overbearing impact on No.7 Cotsford Avenue to the detriment of the amenities of occupiers of this neighbouring property.** Therefore, the proposal fails to comply with Policy DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy.

19/01527/FUL Date of decision: 20th August 2019

LOCATION: 3 Long Walk New Malden KT3 3EJ

PROPOSAL: Conversion of single dwelling house into 2 x self contained flats with provision of private amenity space and cycle and refuse storage (*Retrospective Application*)

Including: **It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the development has not resulted in increased pressure for parking on the surrounding streets.** The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Framework (2019), Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (2016), and Policies CS7 and DM9 of the adopted Core Strategy (2012).

19/00786/FUL Date of decision: 31st May 2019

LOCATION: 8 Ravenswood Avenue Tolworth KT6 7NP

PROPOSAL: Conversion of existing five bedroom dwelling into 2 no. three bedroom dwellings, including erection of hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer roof extension, and widened crossover.

The proposed gable end roof extension and dormer roof extension, **by reason of its bulk, mass and design, would create a dominant addition that would be visually prominent within the streetscene,** and would unbalance the visual symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. This would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the visual amenities of the surrounding area, conflicting with Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Council's LDF Core Strategy (2012) and the Council's Residential Design SPD (2013).

19/02630/HOU Date of decision: 16th December 2019

LOCATION:131 Compton Crescent Chessington KT9 2HG

PROPOSAL: Erection of a two storey side & single storey rear extension, rear dormer roof extension, garage upgrade, front porch extension, loft conversion and associated alterations to fenestration

The proposed two storey side extension by reason of its poor design which includes; the absence of a 0.5m dropped roofline and a proposed width which is greater than 50% of the width of the main dwelling; would be a disproportionate addition which would appear as a visually incongruous and unsympathetic form of development that would be at odds with the street scene of Compton Crescent. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (Adopted April 2012), and the Residential Design SPD (Adopted July 2013).

The proposed rear dormer roof extension by reason of its detailed design which includes: the absence of a sufficient set down from the ridge of the main dwelling; and its overall bulk; would fail to appear proportionate or subordinate to the original property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (Adopted April 2012) and the Residential Design SPD (Adopted July 2013).

The proposed rear decking by virtue of its positioning and height; **would prejudice the neighbouring amenities of the neighbouring dwelling, no.129 Compton Crescent by way of overlooking into their rear garden which would represent a detrimental loss of privacy.** The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames LDF Core Strategy (Adopted April 2012) and the Residential Design SPD (Adopted July 2013).