



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2019

by Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E5330/D/19/3221395
685 Sidcup Road, Eltham SE9 3AQ

- 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 Mrs Gul Ahmet against the decision of the Council of the Royal Borough of Greenwich.
 - The application Ref 18/3250/HD, dated 18 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is front bay window and front porch/single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front bay window and front porch/single storey side extension at 685 Sidcup Road, Eltham SE9 3AQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 18/3250/HD, dated 18 September 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1818_02-01, 1818_02-02 and 1818_02-03;
 - 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 development on the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house with an attached single garage, to its boundary with No 687 Sidcup Road. Front windows are flush with the façade. The property is paired with No 683 Sidcup Road. That has a small front porch, curved windows with a different style of glazing. Residential properties along this section of Sidcup Road are mostly semi-detached/detached and styles differ. Many properties have bay/bow windows, and/or front projections such as porches.

4. The proposed development involves adding a ground floor bay window and small porch to the front; and constructing a single storey side extension, thus replacing the existing garage. The result would be the creation of a new front building line, about 1m further forward. The Council considers that extending to the front, to this degree, is unacceptable.
5. I note from my visit that adjacent pairs of dwellinghouses, Nos 687/689 and Nos 691/693 Sidcup Road have porches and two storey side extensions that protrude, at ground floor, so as to align with front projecting windows. The appellant has brought other similar examples to my attention. Extensions vary between pairs and within pairings. I consider that there is no stringent pattern that further extensions must slavishly adhere to.
6. The side extension is single storey, so there would be no unbalancing of the pair of houses. The proposed bay window would be no wider or higher than the existing. I consider that it is an appropriate small addition to the front. Having regard to the presence of and nature of the porch at No 683, I see no reason that a similar porch would be unacceptable at the appeal property. There is a variety of glazing styles in properties fronting Sidcup Road, as a consequence of permitted development rights. The type of glazing proposed, in white uPVC, would not be a new intervention in the street scene.
7. I find that the side extension would be subservient to the appeal property. It would remain the same breadth and height, and continue to carry a pitched roof, that its lengthening about 1m forward would not be excessive, particularly in relation to the two storey side extension on the other side of the boundary with No 687. The original dwellinghouse would remain prominent and the porch/front extension would not be attached to, or project beyond the bay window.
8. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse or surrounding area. As such, the proposal accords with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan; Policies DH1 and DH(a) of Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies 2014; and Section 5 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Extensions, Basements and Conversions Guidance 2018. Amongst other things, these require a high standard of design, and a scale of development, appropriate to the host building and local context.

Conditions

9. I have imposed conditions with regard to the commencement of the proposed development and the details of the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. I have also required that the materials match the existing dwelling, to ensure that the extension would be in keeping with the host dwelling and those neighbouring.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR