

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/16/3162437
47 Shuttle Close, Sidcup, DA15 8EP.

- 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 Miss N Barnes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref: 16/01551/FUL, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is part two storey and part single storey extensions to existing dwelling incorporating removal of current flat roof two storey addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet style dwelling with a two storey flat roofed extension and single storey garage to one side. The proposals would see the existing extensions replaced with a two storey pitched roof side extension and a further two storey wing set well back from the front elevation. The space to the front of the aforementioned wing would be occupied by a single storey extension.
 4. I take the appellants point that the existing flat roofed extension is unsightly and it has a bolted-on appearance. Whilst the proposed extensions are more sympathetically designed compared thereto, I have concerns that their scale and massing would appear excessive relative to the host dwelling. The resultant property would appear engulfed with extensions and its width in particular, but also its depth would appear uncharacteristically out of scale with surrounding houses. The scale of extensions would be especially evident since as well as the front of the property being visible from the public domain, the side is also clearly visible from the cul-de-sac head. I am also inclined to the Council's view that the multiplicity of roof forms employed would appear overly fussy.
-

5. The Council suggest that the proposals would unbalance the pair of houses, but given that the attached property No 45 has already been extended to one side, and bearing in mind the existing flat roofed extension to the appeal property, that is not a proposition with which I concur. Nonetheless, I consider that the cumulative volume of extensions would amount to overdevelopment of the property and it would fail to integrate with the prevailing character and appearance of the locality. In coming to this view, I am mindful that there are a range of extensions to properties in the area, but I saw none comparable to the scale and design of what is proposed.
6. For these reasons, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would fail to harmonise with the host property and prevailing character of the area. This would bring it into conflict with saved Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan (2004) and the guidance in the Design and Development Control Guideline 2, which seek to ensure that the design and appearance of development is compatible with the character of existing and adjacent buildings and that extensions should not result in over development in terms of scale and mass.

Other Matters

7. The occupier of No 49 Shuttle Close has raised concerns about the proximity of the extension to that property, including loss of outlook from a side facing bedroom window. Whilst the two storey rearwards wing would be slightly offset relative to that window, it would nonetheless constrain the outlook therefrom to one side. This issue alone would not lead me to dismiss the appeal, but it adds to my concerns on the main issue.
8. The occupiers of No 45 Shuttle Close are concerned about overlooking and loss of light. However, as the two storey element would be set away from the boundary with that house and the windows would outlook down the garden to the appeal property, these are not concerns I share.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR