



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 FEBRUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/21/3269695

35 Chester Road, Sidcup, DA15 8RX

- 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 Lait against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/01799/FUL, dated 26 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a joint application for a first-floor rear extension at 35 Chester Road and a part first floor extension at 37 Chester Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Although the application form refers only to 35 Chester Road, it is clear from the description of development that the proposal is for extensions at both 35 and 37 Chester Road. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The application form makes reference to Mr Lait and Mr and Mrs Blakeney, the appeal form refers to Mr Lait only. I have used this name in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwellings and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. Chester Road comprises a mix of terraced and semi-detached properties which front onto the street. Some of the dwellings are gable fronted, others including the appeal properties, and its immediate neighbours, have hipped roofs. The rear of Nos 35 and 37 and their adjoining neighbours are also visible from parts of Orchard Rise East which adjoins Chester Road. When viewing the rear of Chester Road from Orchard Rise East, it is apparent that a number of dwellings along Chester Road have first floor rear extensions. However, these extensions are generally modest and do not cover the whole width of the dwellings.
6. Nos 35 and 37 have previously been extended with single-storey rear extensions spanning the rear of both properties. No 37 also has an existing flat-roofed first floor rear extension which is set away from No 35 and adjoins No 39 more closely. The proposed development would extend both Nos 35 and 37 across the rear of the properties at first floor level. The proposed

development would be finished in materials to match the existing appeal building and would also incorporate a flat roof with parapet walls above the existing eaves.

7. The proposed first floor rear extension across the two properties would be closely sited to the boundaries. The significant height and width of the proposed development, when taken together with its location would be readily visible from Orchard Rise East. In addition, the flat roofed design of the proposed development, with its high parapet walls above the existing eaves, would be discordant with the hipped roof design of the host dwellings and neighbouring dwellings. The scale, siting and design of the proposed development would therefore be incongruous in terms of its relationship with both the host dwellings and the surrounding area.
8. While the existing first floor rear extension at No 37 has a flat roof, this is significantly more limited in width and does not have the same degree of prominence as the proposed development. My attention has also been drawn to other examples of rear extensions in the locality. However, these have differing degrees of prominence from public viewpoints. Furthermore, some of these examples are visually discordant with the character and appearance of the area and the existence of harm does not justify further discordant development. Consequently, this does not change my findings set out above.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwellings and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find conflict with Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy 2012, Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Unitary Development Plan 2004 and the Unitary Design and Development Control Guidelines 2004, all of which seek, amongst other things, to ensure high quality design which does not harm the character or appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework and all other relevant considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR