
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2016

by Mr Kim Bennett BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 03 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/16/3156859
72 Warwick Road, Sidcup DA14 6LJ

- 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 Dan Collins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 16/01270/FUL, dated 23 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a first floor extension to an existing ground floor extension to allow for additional bedroom/study.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension to an existing ground floor extension to allow for additional bedroom/study at 72 Warwick Road, Sidcup DA14 6LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01270/FUL, dated 23 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: drawing entitled 'Proposed Layouts' dated 22 April 2016.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two storey end of terrace house on the corner of Warwick Road and Oxford Road. It has a double piled main roof with twin gables to Oxford Road and an existing single storey extension attached to the rear part of the eastern flank wall. The extension is enclosed by a high boarded fence which runs along the eastern boundary on the back edge of the footpath in Oxford Road. Adjoining that to the south west and also set forward on the back edge of the footpath, is a single storey industrial building. Although the majority of the local area comprises Victorian terraces, there are also occasional

infill plots of differing designs, including three town houses directly opposite the site.

4. The Council is concerned that the proposed extension would be a significant intrusion into the street scene in this prominent location. Whilst I agree that the extension would be clearly visible, I do not consider it necessarily follows that it would be intrusive. The extension would be limited in overall size and the design would complement that of the existing building, including a continuation of the rear roof element to extend the existing gable end, a ridge height which would be lower than the main ridge, and with matching materials to the existing house. The extension would also be wholly contained within the existing curtilage demarcated by the boundary fence. In my view therefore it would appear as an integral and sympathetic addition to the existing dwelling. Although somewhat unusual in terms of an extension to a terraced house, the end of terrace location warrants a slightly different approach, and as referred to above, there are occasional differing design interventions in the locality so that an alternative design but one which still respects the characteristics of the existing dwelling, would not be out of place in the street scene.
5. Whilst the extension would be clearly visible when looking south along Oxford Road, the property already extends slightly to the east of the building line along Oxford Road to its north, and the extension would be seen against the backdrop of the industrial building beyond it, which would be approximately on the same building line, and with mature trees to the rear. In that respect therefore I do not consider it would be intrusive as the Council suggests.
6. For the above reasons there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2004, Policy CS06 of the Council's Core Strategy 2012 and the Design and Development Control Guideline 2, in that it would be well designed and compatible with the existing and adjacent buildings as well as the surrounding area.
7. Conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for matching materials are necessary in the interests of certainty and visual amenity. Accordingly, subject to these conditions the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR