
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/25/3373579

67 Manor Drive, Surbiton, KT5 8NF

- 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 Yatin Vadhia against the decision of Council of the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
 - The application Reference is 25/01737/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of garage and storage, erection of part two storey/part single storey side and single storey rear extension; erection of single storey front porch extension; erection of double hip to gable with barn hips and rear dormer roof extensions with 2nos. Juliet balconies and 4nos. front rooflights to facilitate loft conversion; and installation of solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are 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 two-storey detached home with attractive proportions, façade and overall design on a triangular plot at the end of a row of substantial dwellings with generous gardens. Most of the nearby dwellings have a similar design idiom to the appeal property. The locality has a very pleasing established character and a good quality suburban ambiance. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The changes planned for the host property would be overly extensive in bulk and lack appropriate form in detail. The roof extensions would almost obliterate the original pleasing arrangement and the combination of these along with the proposal for considerable works on the side, all accentuated by solar panels and somewhat random window, would lead to a dwelling of ungainly arrangement and appearance. The proposal simply cannot be described as good design in this context and would unduly impinge upon the character and appearance attributes of the locality, drawing upon little within this streetscene and failing to harmonise with the original dwelling. The locality in general has a sense of subtlety of built form; regrettably this scheme would not.
-

5. Policy D10 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy DM10 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 are relevant. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek well designed development appropriate to a site and its setting and of a suitable scale and form such that local distinctiveness would be protected. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies.

Other matters

6. I am aware of the planning history on this site. In particular, Council references 25/01236/HOUF and 25/01190/CPUF and the similarities of these schemes, when combined, relative to the appeal proposal. I note the Appellant's 'fall-back' argument. However, the schemes would not be able to be constructed together under the above references and applicable legislation; and I am dealing with the entity of a partially differing appeal proposal, looking at matters as a whole, and working in the context of relevant planning policies. The appeal scheme would not represent good design and consequently I could not condone this proposal.
7. I have reviewed the examples of extensions drawn to my attention. However, I found none of those to be directly comparable in design or siting terms and anyway not all would represent a good quality design benchmark in my opinion. In any event I must determine this proposal on its own merits.
8. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant, including the merits of planned renewables and energy efficiency, but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
9. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered. Key objectives of the document are to safeguard qualities of the built environment and the development plan policies which I cite mirror this.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR