
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2021

by **David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 06 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3269275

16 Palm Avenue, Sidcup DA14 5JG

- 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 C Warner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/02474/FUL, dated 1 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is for a two-storey side extension with front facing projection to include a porch/wc together with a large box dormer on the rear facing roof slope of No 16 Palm Avenue, the end property in a terrace of four two-storey dwellings in a well-established residential area.
4. The proposal includes three elements. Although the side extension would be flush with the front elevation of the existing property and would almost double its width, resulting in the terrace losing its existing symmetry, this has already happened opposite in the case of Nos 73A-79 and the gap to the side of No 16 is unusually wide. The adjacent property No 14 around the corner also has a similar extension, albeit in that case balanced visually by a new property at the other end No 8A. In the circumstances the side extension is acceptable, its depth is necessarily limited by the diagonal outlook from the rear windows of No 14 next door, and importantly the ridge of the hipped roof would be lower than that of the existing terrace to give a subsidiary appearance.
5. Associated with this would be a single storey front facing projection. Whilst this would relate slightly awkwardly to the double height bay window there are already similar extensions as already mentioned at Nos 73/73A, 14 and 8A. The front facing rooflights would not be particularly noticeable.
6. However, the third element of the proposal, the rear facing box dormer, would occupy almost all of the rear facing roof slope. This would involve remodelling

the existing hipped roof to provide a full height end gable, in contrast to the hipped roof at the other end of the terrace. Whilst partly screened by the side extension, this would unduly affect the appearance of the terrace. In addition, the box dormer would only be marginally set back from the rear elevation of the property and with its flat roof at the same height as the main ridgeline would create the appearance of an extra storey when seen from the rear. It is appreciated that there are similar box dormers nearby behind Nos 73 and 8 but these lie behind mid-terrace properties and do not justify a further box dormer in the prominent position now proposed.

7. For these reasons the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy CS06 of the Bexley Core Strategy 2012 and Policies EN39, H9 and the Design and Development Control Guideline 2 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004. These require new development to be in keeping and compatible with the character of the area, to be a high standard of design, for extensions to be subordinate to the existing building, and for roof extensions to be set back from the main wall of the dwelling to avoid creating the appearance of an extra storey.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would provide substantial additional living accommodation for the occupiers of No 16 but this benefit does not outweigh the harm identified under the main issue and the associated conflict with the development plan.
9. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR