



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 DECEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/22/3302052

12 The Ridge, Surbiton KT5 8HX

- 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 Sunjeev Bhatia against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref 22/00570/HOU, dated 22 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of single-storey rear, front and first floor side extensions; conversion of existing garage to habitable room with associated changes to fenestration. Hip to gable and rear dormer roof extension with installation of 1no front rooflight to facilitate loft conversion, and installation of solar panels to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The immediate area comprises two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings. While dwellings have been extended to the side, there is a sense of spaciousness at roof level between the built form. This spaciousness is achieved by the lateral separation of roof forms in combination with their design and this makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The two-storey extension would extend toward 10 The Ridge and it would incorporate a gable ended roof with a small, hip at the apex. This side roof design is not replicated within the immediate area and its bulk, mass and design would substantially erode the space between the appeal site and No 10. This would fail to be sympathetic to the existing sense of spaciousness causing unacceptable visual harm to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Solar panels would not in themselves be unacceptable, however the spread of panels in combination with the size and scale of the roof would exacerbate the visual harm I have set out above. The appellant suggests alternative roof tiles could be used to soften the impact of the solar panels, however, this would not overcome the unacceptable roof design.

6. The proposed solar panels would promote renewable energy which is an important consideration in reducing climate change. This carries weight in favour of the proposed development, however, character and appearance is also a legitimate planning consideration. The unacceptable design of the roof is therefore not outweighed by the benefits which may be derived from solar panels.
7. While roof designs differ within the wider area, my assessment is based on the local street scene. Local distinctiveness is an important consideration, and the presence of similar development elsewhere does not automatically indicate that it would be acceptable in other circumstances. I have considered this appeal on its own merits and in its own context as set out above.
8. Accordingly, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area and there would be conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies CS8 and DM10 of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy 2012 and Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021. All of which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. As such, the proposal is contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR