

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/20/3261405

193 Halfway Street, Sidcup DA15 8DE

- 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 Hancock against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/01808/FUL, dated 23 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extensions at 193 Halfway Street, Sidcup DA15 8DE. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/01808/FUL, dated 23 July 2020, 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: 193-HALFWAY-STREET-01 Revision A (site location plan) and 193-HALFWAY-STREET-02 Revision A (proposed floor plan and elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The roof area of the extensions hereby permitted shall not be used as a sitting out area, balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area and shall only be accessed for repair, maintenance or for emergency access/egress.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a residential road of mixed property types. The proposal involves infilling to either side of an
-

existing central single storey extension, to create an extension of the same depth across the dwelling's full width.

4. Policy H9 of the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004 (the UDP) 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. Policy ENV39 of the UDP requires a high standard of design in new development, including extensions, while Policy CS06 of the London Borough of Bexley Core Strategy 2012, which concerns the Sidcup geographic region, includes the requirement that development should be in keeping with local character. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly section twelve concerning good design.
5. The *Design and Development Control Guidelines* provides more detailed guidance to support the implementation of development plan policies. The guidance says that in general extensions should be subordinate to the existing building and that development should not result in overdevelopment in terms of scale and mass, car parking and remaining amenity area¹.
6. The Council's principal concern is that the proposed extensions in combination with previous enlargement of the original dwelling would result in overdevelopment. I note, however, that both the relevant policies and the guidance refer to the effects on the existing rather than original building. Moreover, the surrounding area includes a range of dwelling types and sizes and, therefore, it is appropriate to consider the effects of the extensions with regard to the existing physical circumstances.
7. The existing single storey rear extension is of typical domestic scale and appearance. The proposed extensions would be contained within the existing rear patio area, within a large garden with good separation between neighbouring properties. The infilling to either side would respect the height and depth of the existing feature to the rear and, as such, would remain subordinate to the main two storey dwelling. Furthermore, the changes proposed to the rear would not be readily visible from the surrounding area.
8. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extensions would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, there is no conflict with Policies H9 and ENV39 of the UDP or with Policy CS06 of the Core Strategy, referred to above.

Conditions

9. Of the Council's suggested conditions I have imposed the standard time condition and, to ensure the proper implementation of development in accordance with the submitted details, one requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I agree that a condition requiring the external materials used to match those of the existing building is needed in the interests of the appearance of the host dwelling and wider area. I agree also that it is necessary to restrict the potential use of the roof of the extensions to protect the privacy of neighbouring properties.

¹ Paragraph 2.2.1(3).

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR