



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2021

by J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3275240
20 Christchurch Road, SIDCUP, DA15 7HQ

- 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 V Katukuri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 21/00066/FUL, dated 8 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a new first floor, a single-storey rear extension, and a pitched roof over the existing porch to the existing bungalow to form a two-storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a new first floor, a single-storey rear extension, and a pitched roof over the existing porch to the existing bungalow to form a two-storey dwelling at 20 Christchurch Road, SIDCUP, DA15 7HQ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00066/FUL, dated 8 January 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 20.438-1 Rev A; 20.438-2 Rev A; 20.438-3 Rev A; 20.438-4 Rev A; 20.438-5 Rev A; Site Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. No 20 Christchurch Road lies within the Christchurch Conservation Area (CA). The Council considers that the principle and design of the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and I concur with that viewpoint.
3. As a result of the above, the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings by way of outlook.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached, L-shaped bungalow situated on the eastern side of Christchurch Road, close to its junction with Victoria Road. The front elevation of the bungalow continues approximately the front building line of the houses on either side, but the rear of the dwelling is set further back from the rear of those properties. The bungalow has rendered walls and hipped roofs to both the east-west and north-south arms that give it its L-shape.
5. The proposed development would involve the construction of a first-floor above most of the existing bungalow, and the construction of a single-storey extension, some 4.9 metres in depth at the rear of the dwelling. The two-storey element would have a hipped roof, while the single-storey rear extension would have a flat roof. There would also be a hipped roof constructed over the front porch to match that of the roof of the main dwelling.
6. Policy ENV39 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) indicates that the Council will seek to ensure that all new developments, including alterations and extensions, are satisfactorily located, and are of a high standard of design and layout. In determining applications for development, the Council will consider, amongst other things, the extent to which the proposal is compatible with the character of the surrounding area, and whether it would prejudice the environment of the occupiers of adjacent property.
7. The Council contends that by reason of its siting and increase in height the proposed first-floor extension would result in the creation of a prominent and overbearing two-storey property which would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the occupiers of nos. 18 and 22 Christchurch Road.
8. The appellant contends that a small rear two-storey extension was approved as part of a planning permission for a new two-storey house in 2014, and that this extension would have been nearly as deep as the current proposal. Moreover, the current proposal would have a two-storey element only around 2 metres deeper than the current rear elevation at No 22, but with a lower eaves and ridge height. Finally, the appellant notes that the single-storey extension would be less than 1 metre deeper into the rear garden than the existing bungalow.
9. With regard to No 18 Christchurch Road, I note the point raised by the appellant relating to the earlier permission. Whilst this was given in 2014, there has been no change in development plan policy since that date. Moreover, the proposed first-floor extension closest to No 18 would be only around 4 metres in depth overall, and would be set nearly 3 metres away from the joint boundary. Furthermore, the roof ridge height of this part of the extension would be only around 1 metre higher than the roof ridge height of the rear portion of the current bungalow. On this basis, I do not consider that the first-floor extension would appear prominent or overbearing from the perspective of the occupiers of No 18.
10. With regard to No 22 Christchurch Road, whilst the first-floor element of the proposal would project around 2 metres beyond the existing rear elevation of No 24, it would have a relatively low eaves height and a hipped roof sloping away from the boundary. Moreover, the existing bungalow projects around 6 metres beyond the rear elevation of No 22 and has a high hipped roof. This rear portion of the current bungalow would be largely replaced with a single-

storey extension having a flat roof, which would, arguably, be less prominent and overbearing. On balance, I do not consider that the proposed development would appear significantly more prominent and overbearing than the existing situation when viewed from the rear of No 22.

11. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development at No 20 Christchurch Road would not be significantly harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings by way of outlook. On this basis it would not prejudice the environment of the occupiers of adjacent property and would not, therefore, conflict with Policy ENV39 of the UDP.

Other Matter

12. I note that there has been an objection to the proposal from the occupiers of No 24 Victoria Road, which lies to the east of the appeal property. The Council considers that there would not be any significant adverse impact from the proposed development with regard to light, and I concur with that view. In addition, the roof ridge height of that part of the two-storey element that would be closest to the dwelling at No 24 would be only around 1 metre higher than the current roof ridge height, and it would be set back from the boundary with No 24 by around 2 metres from its current position. I consider that this would not result in the proposed development having a prominent or overbearing appearance.

Conditions

13. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR