



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2021

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3277968

16 Royal Road, Sidcup, DA14 4RQ

- 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 D Holloway against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref: 21/00804/FUL, dated 11 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single/part two storey rear extension, two storey side extension, single storey front extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the paired property of No.14 Royal Road.

Reasons

3. No.16 Royal Road is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located at the junction with Princes Close and in a residential area. The adjoining property of No.14 Royal Road has substantial extensions.
4. Bexley Core Strategy policy CS01 seeks to achieve sustainable development. Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) refer to the need for development to have high design standards and to respect the amenity of neighbours.
5. The Council considers that the proposed extensions would have no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours. I see no reason to disagree because the first floor rear extension would be set around 3 m away from the side boundary with No.14.
6. The Council considers that the proposals would represent over-development and refers to the lack of a set down from the house roof for the two storey side extension and lack of a set-back of that extension from the existing front elevation. The roof of the side extension at No.14 has been set-down from the ridgeline of the house and there is a set-back at first floor level. However, the scale and form of the extension has resulted in the pair of semi-detached dwellings appearing unbalanced.

7. The existence of two storey front bays provided the original distinctive character and appearance for the semi-detached pair. The appeal proposal seeks to provide an additional bay in a symmetrical design at the front elevation. The Bexley UDP *Design and Development Control Guidelines* advise that two storey side or first floor extensions over existing accommodation should be designed to be subordinate to the main dwelling. Ideally this should incorporate a set-back of the front elevation of the extension. The roof plane of the extension should respect the roof plane of the original house, thereby lowering the ridge line. The proposed two storey side extension does not meet the guidance. However, I note that the advice is guidance only and I consider that the context of other development in the immediate vicinity must be taken into account.
8. Whilst the design, with an additional frontage bay, reflects that of the original house, the contrast with the style and form of extensions at No.14 would add to the lack of balance between the pair of semi-detached dwellings. The proposed side extension would also be out of keeping with the pair of semi-detached dwellings at Nos 20 and 18 Royal Road which are separated from No.16 by Princes Close. These dwellings both have side extensions with no additional frontage bay or set down of the roof of the extension from the ridgeline of the house. The guidance also indicates that new two storey side extensions on plots with at least 4 m between the flank wall of the dwelling and the site boundary should be set in at least 1 m from the boundary. The flank wall of the side and rear extension at No.18 Royal Road is situated on the boundary with the rear of the footway to Princes Close. However, although the flank wall of the proposed side and rear extension would be around 350 mm from the side boundary, its visual impact on Princes Close would be greater because the rear extension would be two storeys in height next to the road rather than single storey.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a similar extension which is under construction at No.7 Royal Road. That extension has no set back from the front elevation and no set-down of the roof from the ridgeline of the house. However, it does have different circumstances compared to that of the appeal proposal. That is because No.7 is within a row of semi-detached properties where frontage bays predominate rather than in a prominent corner position where dwellings have been extended without incorporating bays.
10. Overall, I consider that the proposed two storey side extension and two storey element of the rear extension would appear discordant and prominent at the entrance to Princes Close because of their form, design, scale and massing and the context set by the extensions to the semi-detached dwellings at this particular road junction. The extensions would represent overdevelopment and would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the paired property of No.14 Royal Road. The proposals would therefore conflict with Core Strategy policy CS01 and UDP Policies ENV39 and H9.
11. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR