

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/17/3168648
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 16/02705/FUL, dated 24 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey side and rear extensions to existing dwelling and introduction of rear dormer and front/side rooflights with application incorporating removal of current flat roof two storey addition.
-

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 with particular regard to streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies at the head of a cul-de sac and is a semi-detached house which has been extended. Shuttle Close is characterised by a series of 1930s chalet style semi-detached dwellings. However, many have been extended over time and whilst the original chalet design features can generally be seen in the elevations of the houses, there is now a great variety in sizes and designs of the properties in the street.
 4. The appeal property has been extended sideways in the form of a flat roofed two storey extension and a single storey garage alongside it. Whilst the flat roofed two storey extension allows the original chalet gable features to stand out in the streetscene, it does contrast starkly with the hipped roof extension of its adjoining semi-detached house, No 45.
 5. The property on the other side of the appeal property, No 49, has been extended sideways too, but with a false tiled parapet design along the front edge of both its flat roof two storey extension and adjoining garage. No 49 is stepped back from the alignment of the appeal property, around the curve of the head of the cul-de-sac.
-

6. The proposal would extend the roof over the existing flat roof two storey extension, and create living accommodation in the roof space. There would also be a rear dormer running across most of the width of the extended rear roof, a second storey rear extension and other alterations such as rooflights and a pitched roof on the garage. The roof design of the house would be 'clipped' to accommodate a part gable/part hipped roofline.
7. The proposed development would introduce significant bulk into the roof and would contrast with the adjoining properties either side. This impact would be accentuated by the fact the existing flat roofed extension is more or less flush with the gable of original chalet house frontage. This means that, when looking from the direction of the cul-de-sac entrance, the proposed development would not be so clearly subservient to the original house as it would be on a property where the side extension is stepped back from the original building line.
8. Moreover though, the alignment of the property and No 49 around the curved head of the cul-de-sac means that the part gable of the proposed extension would be overly dominant and imposing in the streetscene at the head of the cul-de-sac. Given this alignment, the proposed rear dormer, which would not step down from the ridge line, and to some extent, the proposed extensive second floor rear extension, would also be dominant in views from the head of the cul de sac.
9. I recognise that the appellant has attempted to address the concerns of the Council and the Inspector in relation to a previous scheme and appeal¹. Whilst the proposed second storey element above the rear part of the garage has been removed, the proposal now incorporates a significantly large dormer extension on the rear. Amongst other matters, the Inspector was concerned that the cumulative volume of extensions would amount to overdevelopment of, and would engulf, the existing property. I have similar concerns in relation to this proposal, considering it would result in a dwelling of a scale that was discordant on this cul-de-sac.
10. Despite the amendments, I consider that the proposal would represent an over-dominant and bulky form of development which would jar with the design of adjacent properties and would have a detrimental impact on the streetscene at the head of Shuttle Close. Whilst there would be a benefit in terms of increased living accommodation within the property, this would be outweighed by the harm to the streetscene which would result.
11. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the streetscene. It would be contrary to Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2004 which require new development to respect local character, be well designed and be compatible with the streetscene, and its existing and adjacent buildings.
12. I consider that those policies are generally consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and so have afforded them considerable weight. The other policies referred to me by the Council do not add to its case.
13. I also consider that the proposed development conflicts with the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines 2004 and section 2.3 in particular

¹ APP/D5120/D/16/3162437

which provides guidance in relation to extensions including those to roofs and chalet style properties.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR