



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3233028

4 Arlington Close, Sidcup DA15 8JW

- 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 P Skubis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref: 19/00633/FUL, dated 12 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a side first floor extension, rear dormer roof extension, installation of roof light to front roof slope and external insulated render.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted for a side first floor extension, rear dormer roof extension, installation of roof light to front roof slope and external insulated render at 4 Arlington Close, Sidcup DA15 8JW, in accordance with the terms of the application, 19/00633/FUL, dated 12 March 2019, 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 plans: 1420-01aPL (Existing Elevations, Location Plan, and Block Plan); 1420-02aPL; and 1420-01aPL (Proposed Elevations); and 1420-04aPL.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. 1420-01aPL (Proposed Elevations).

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the first floor side extension upon the character of the site.

Reasons

3. The building consists of a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. Surrounding dwellings within the vicinity are generally either semi-detached or terraced houses. A number of these have been the subject of side extensions that have been carried out in a variety of different styles.
4. Whilst the proposed extension would extend the dwelling beyond the existing hipped roof, the footprint of the building would not increase. Accordingly, the

separation distance between the dwelling and the adjoining house at 6 Arlington Close would not increase. Therefore, the amount of space around the dwelling would remain consistent with the existing arrangement.

5. The extension is of an appropriate design that includes some features present, to a degree, at the existing dwelling. These include the use of a hipped roof. Whilst this is smaller than that currently present, it is relatively well screened by the neighbouring dwellings at No. 6 and 2 Arlington Close and ensures that the extension is constructed in a style consistent with the original dwelling.
6. In addition, the front elevation of the extension would be set back from the front elevation of the main dwelling. This ensures that the extension is subordinate towards the main house, and that the existing building remains the predominant form of development. Accordingly, whilst the extension would feature a shallower front roof pitch than the existing dwelling, the development would not be particularly prominent either on the site, or elsewhere within the surrounding area.
7. The submitted plans show that the elevations of the extension would have a different treatment to the existing dwelling. However, owing to the relatively small scale of the development, the fact that the roof tiles would match the existing dwelling and the lack of prominence of the development as a result of the positioning of the proposal, this would not result in a notable detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the site.
8. In reaching this view, I have had regard to the surrounding area, which includes several different extensions that have been carried out in a variety of materials. This factor contributes to the general definition of the area's character.
9. Owing to the pattern of development to the rear of the appeal site, direct views are particularly limited. Accordingly, the proposed extension would not be particularly prominent within the wider area.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not lead to an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the site. The development would therefore comply with Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan (2004) (the Unitary Development Plan); Policy CS06 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012) and Development Control Guideline 2 of the Unitary Development Plan. These seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that developments are compatible with the character of their sites, existing buildings, and surrounding areas; have an appropriate massing; and are of appropriate siting, design and external appearance.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard condition regarding the implementation of the development, a condition concerning the approved plans is necessary in the interests of precision.
12. I note that the Council has requested a condition requiring that the extension be constructed from materials that match the existing dwelling. Whilst a condition regarding materials is necessary in order to maintain the character of the area, this wording does not conform with the details shown on the submitted plans. For the reasons set out previously, I have concluded that the proposed palette of materials is acceptable. Accordingly, I have amended the

wording of this condition in order to reflect the information contained on the approved plans.

Conclusion

13. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted, subject to conditions.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR