



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2021

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3264532
62 Princes Close, Sidcup DA14 4RH

- 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 M. Constantino against the decision of London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02159/FUL, dated 3 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2020.
 - The development was for single storey side and rear extension .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side and rear extension at 62 Princes Close, Sidcup in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02159/FUL, dated 3 September 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 200901-21D (Proposed Elevations) and 200901-31B (proposed Site Plan) both dated 1 September 2020.
 - ii) 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.
 - iii) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi detached house that faces onto an attractive horse shoe type green to the front with this part of Princes Close forming a kind of crescent that I consider is typical of areas of suburban housing of this type.
4. The appeal property, like most in the vicinity, is characterised by a hipped pantile roof, front bay windows to ground and first floors, red brick elevations

and a modest flat roof side extension that appeared to have been recently demolished prior to my site visit. The rear garden is of a good size with a high fence and shrubbery forming the initial lengths of the common boundary from the rear of the house.

5. The proposal seeks permission for a new single storey side and rear extension that will protrude by around 3.5 metre from the rear of the house before returning around the side and encompassing the footprint of the original flat roof element of the building and remaining set back from the front elevation of the property by some distance.
6. I saw on my site visit that there are several similar extensions that have presumably either rebuilt, or re-roofed the older flat roof elements to the side of these properties. I was directed specifically to the extension to the neighbouring property at number 63 who have extended in a similar manner albeit with a slightly different roof form being used.
7. In considering this appeal I give great weight to the Policy requirements contained within Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Policies H9 and ENV39 and the UDP Design Guidance that seek to ensure proposals for residential extensions meet high standards of design.
8. In doing so I consider that the proposed design offers as a solution a contextual, pitched roof extension to be built of similar materials and that is well set back from the front of the house and so remaining subservient. In light of this I consider that the above policy requirements have been met.
9. In assessing the size and footprint of the proposed extension, I consider the existing plot is easily large enough to accommodate such an extension without causing harm to either the host property or the overriding character and appearance of the area. As such, when considered with respect to the size, character and appearance of the site in question, the proposed extension will not appear out of proportion, incongruous or over dominant.
10. In conclusion therefore I consider that the policy requirements within Core Strategy Policy CS01, Policies H9 and ENV 39 of the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the UDP Design and Development Guidance 2, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) have been met and planning permission should be granted.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions set out above.

A Graham

INSPECTOR