



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2021

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/21/3282502

59 The Ridings, Surbiton KT5 8HG

- 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 Scott Deng against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01594/HOU, dated 15 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 03 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Erection of two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension. Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extension with installation of 2 no. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'erection of two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension. Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extension with installation of 2 no. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion' at 59 The Ridings, Surbiton KT5 8HG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01594/HOU, dated 15 May 2021, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form was "*Two story side extension, one story rear extension, 6.00m deep, 4.00m pitched roof height, hipe to gable for a loft conversion and internal layout alterations*" (SIC). This description was amended following submission of the application and the new description better reflects the development proposed. As such, I have referred to the amended description for the purposes of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, specifically in respect of the proposed roof form.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling situated within The Ridings, which is a predominantly residential street. The Ridings comprises of a variety of dwelling types, sizes and styles. Despite this variance, there is nonetheless a cohesive sense of local character along the street. The Appellant identifies this local character as being defined by two-storey built forms, siting, and

alignment of front elevations, as well as special separation at boundaries. Whilst I concur with this assessment, local character is also defined by the prevalence of certain variations of early twentieth century dwellings which create a strong sense of place and attractive streetscape, though not complete uniformity. Hipped roofs and extended hipped roofs which incorporate a catslide element over side extensions and garages are key features of these dwelling types, and as such, roofscape is an important element of the attractive streetscape and local character.

5. The appeal site is such a dwelling. Its existing roof is a simple shallow hip, although the attached dwelling has a side extension over which the main shallow hip has been extended. As such, there is a certain degree of imbalance across the semi-detached pair.
6. The appeal scheme would introduce a rear extension, two-storey side extension and a loft conversion, facilitated by a box dormer. The proposed roof would be a partial gable end to accommodate the box dormer and then a shallow hip to catslide to encompass the side extension. The rear extension is permitted development following a prior notification granted in April 2021 (Council ref. 21/00585/PAEXT). The hip to gable conversion and box dormer roof extension are also permitted development, as established by a Certificate of Lawful Development issued in April 2021 (Council ref. 21/00573/CPU). As there is a realistic likelihood that these elements of the appeal scheme would be implemented regardless of the outcome of this appeal, I consider the rear and roof extension including hip to gable conversion comprise a 'fallback' scheme. The two-storey side extension element of the appeal scheme is therefore the main element in contention.
7. The introduction of a side extension would not unbalance the semi-detached pair, given the existing side extension to the attached dwelling. Conversely, the side extension would re-establish a sense of symmetry. The Council's objection to the scheme is limited to the roof design. The appeal scheme would introduce a gabled roof, which is not typical of such dwelling types and would be out of character with the wider roofscape of the surroundings. It is also regrettable that the existing hipped roof would not be extended over the side extension to match the roof treatment across the semi-detached pair. However, as outlined above, the hip to gable extension is a fallback scheme. The appeal scheme would reduce the prominence of the gable end by introducing a partial hip above the two-storey side extension, which would also catslide. This would mitigate to some extent the effect of the gable end on the roofscape of the street and would reflect other roof designs in the area, albeit not identically.
8. For these reasons, in the particular circumstances of the case, I consider that the appeal scheme would not result in an incongruous and unbalanced roof form and would not cause undue harm to the character of the host dwelling or area. The scheme would therefore accord with policy D3 of the London Plan (LP), adopted in 2021, and policy DM10 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (CS), adopted in 2012. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a high quality design which respects, maintains or enhances character and local distinctiveness.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard conditions requiring the development is carried out in a timely manner in accordance with the approved plans. The Council has

requested an additional condition which would require the submission of details for secure cycle parking in accordance with policy DM8 of the CS and policies T2 and T4 of the LP. Policy DM8 requires that new development provides facilities on-site for cyclists as appropriate in accordance with standards set out in the Sustainable Transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD sets out cycle parking standards for new dwellings but does not include requirements for residential extensions. Policies T2 and T4 set out strategic aims to promote healthy streets and sustainable modes of transport across London in line with standards and strategies set out in development plans; these policies make no specific requirements for cycle parking provision for extended dwellings. I therefore consider that the suggested condition would not meet with the requirements of the relevant tests for the imposition of conditions.

Conclusion

10. For these reasons, the proposal accords with the relevant policies of the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is accordingly allowed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 following approved plans: OS Site Plan 59-121- HHF February 2021, Proposed Ground and First Floor Plan 59-124-HHF May 2021, Proposed Second and Roof Plan 59-125-HHF May 2021; and, Proposed Elevations Plan 59-126-HHF May 2021.