

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 March 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3262922

129 Days Lane, Sidcup DA15 8JT

- 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 Stokes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/01988/FUL, dated 14 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'single storey extension of a semi-detached chalet house. Partial demolition and partial upgrade of existing attached garage so that it can become a usable room and bathroom. Plus, extension to the rear of the property so that kitchen can be made larger and open plan. Pitched, tiled roof all around with velux in bathroom for natural light'.
-

Preliminary Matters

1. The proposed extension has been built and, therefore, I have dealt with this appeal as involving an application for retrospective planning permission.
2. The parties refer to an approved extension of similar form to the appeal proposal, but of more limited height¹. While I note this approved extension, this appeal involves a separate proposal which I have considered on its own merits.

Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey extension of a semi-detached chalet house, partial demolition and partial upgrade of existing attached garage so that it can become a usable room and bathroom, extension to the rear of the property so that kitchen can be made larger and open plan, pitched tiled roof all around with velux in bathroom for natural light (retrospective) at 129 Days Lane, Sidcup DA15 8JT. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/01988/FUL, dated 14 August 2020.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

¹ Ref 19/03071/FUL.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling in a residential road of similar property types and terraced housing. The proposal comprises a single storey side extension utilising the existing garage that wraps around to form a new rear extension. The Council's principal concern is the effects resulting from the height of the side extension.
6. No 129 originally had a flat-roofed garage directly next to the same form of garage belonging to the neighbouring property, No 127. The eaves height of the proposed extension in relation to the neighbouring garage is not shown on the submitted plans. However, as built the eaves are only marginally higher than those of the neighbouring garage. As such, the extension does not appear incongruous or overbearing in relation to the neighbouring property.
7. This part of the street scene has limited uniformity between properties, with some original flat-roofed garages, infill extensions and a number of side extensions with mono-pitched roofs as proposed here. Consequently, the side extension is not an uncharacteristic or otherwise incongruous feature within the surrounding area.
8. As the height of the eaves is only marginally greater than the eaves height of the original garage, there is not a sufficient degree of change to result in material harm to the proportions and appearance of the appeal property as a whole. The pitch and height of the extended roof where it joins the side elevation of No 129 is not unusual with regard to the type of domestic extension proposed here. Moreover, as the appellant indicates, there are examples of side extensions with similar roof heights nearby, notably at No 77. Consequently, the proposal does not result in a harmful change to the host dwelling's character and appearance.
9. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the side extension does not have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, there is no conflict with Policy H9 of the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004, which requires residential extensions to be compatible with the character of the existing and adjacent buildings, and to not result in overdevelopment in terms of scale and mass; or with Policy 7.6 of The London Plan, which concerns architectural quality. There is also no conflict with the design provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

10. The Council suggests three standard conditions, concerning commencement, compliance with plans and matching materials. However, as the development has been undertaken these are unnecessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR