



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2020

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3251958

64 Northcote Road, Sidcup, Kent, DA14 6PW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Archer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/00366/GPDE, dated 7 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Procedural matter

1. The provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended, under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Part A.4(7) require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made on the same basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of adjoining premises with regard to outlook and light.
 4. No 64 Northcote Road is the central property in a row of three terraced houses. The layout of these properties to the rear sees two-storey projections from the main rear elevations of the houses. This leaves a narrow space between the rear elevations of Nos. 64 and the adjoining house of No. 66.
 5. The proposed extension would fill this space at ground floor level, within the curtilage of No. 64, to a depth of 5.18m from the main rear elevation. The drawings show a parapet along this extension on the boundary with No. 66, which would be 2.61m high.
 6. There is a window to the ground floor rear elevation of No. 66, which I am informed serves a living room, and also a kitchen window facing the proposed
-

extension. An objection to the proposed development has been received from the occupier of No. 66. From my observations at the site visit I concur the depth and height of the proposal would have a harmful effect on amenity. There would be a significant overbearing effect upon the outlook from both those windows, and hence reduction in the quality of the living accommodation at No. 66. This would be a greater impact than that caused by the existing fence, which is lower than the height of the proposed extension.

7. I further consider there is likely to be an appreciable loss of light to those windows and the rooms behind. Although the proposed extension would sit to the north of the windows, I observed that levels of light in this narrow area between Nos. 64 and 66 is already reduced, and so any further material reduction in light should be avoided.
8. I note the appellant would be able to undertake a single storey rear extension of the same scale but with a projection of 3.5m (confirmed by application ref. 19/02313/GPDE). I consider the increased depth in the current scheme to be notably greater than that scheme and would lead to material harm compared to any impact that might occur with the implementation of the shorter extension.
9. The location of the proposed extension means it would not give rise to any impact on the amenities of the adjoining property of No. 62. However, due to the harmful impact on the amenity on No. 66 I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR