



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1st February 2022

by Megan Thomas Q.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 8th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3286247

17 Shuttle Close, Sidcup, Kent DA15 8EP

- 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 Nathan Gee against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref.21/01558/FUL, dated 10 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension with extension at roof level to form rooms in roofspace with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, its semi-pair and the wider streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached house on the north west side of Shuttle Close. It has some off-road parking at the front. Its semi-pair is no.19. Shuttle Close is predominantly residential in nature, in terms of land use and built form.
4. The existing dwelling has a front-facing half gable at the front and a hipped roof on the main section behind. The front door is on the flank elevation. At the rear it has two attached single storey extensions, one with a pitched roof and one with a flat roof. It is proposed to alter the hipped roof to a gable end side extension, with built form closer to no.15 Shuttle Close. At the rear there would be a wide roof dormer structure with two windows, and a part two-storey, part single storey rear extension with a roof lantern in the single storey element.
5. The proposed side extension would sit flush with the main front elevation extending the roof and creating a gable end form which would sit level with the main ridge of the property. As a result, the proposed development would add significant bulk to the host dwelling particularly the roof. It would not appear as a subservient addition, or one that respects the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the semi-pair or wider streetscene. The adjoining semi-pair has not been extended to its side and retains its full hipped roof profile.

6. In respect of the rear part-single, part-two storey stepped extension, its height and depth would be subservient to the main dwelling and it would sit at a similar height to the nearby rear projection. The private amenity space that would be retained in the rear garden would be an adequate and useable size.
7. Turning to the wider streetscene, I noted on my site visit that there were several front elevations which had had flush-fronted extensions constructed. However, the Council indicate that most were granted prior to the current policy and guidance coming into force or were permissible in order to balance the appearance of semi-paired dwellings which had already been extended. I have also taken into account that there are examples of set back extensions in the Close which succeed in being subservient to the host dwellings.
8. Overall, in this case, I conclude that the proposal would result in an awkward addition to the host dwelling, with nos 17 and 19 appearing unbalanced and the wider streetscene also being harmed. There would be harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-pair and the wider area in breach of saved policies H9 and ENV 39 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan (adopted April 2004) and policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy.

Conclusion

9. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas Q.C.

INSPECTOR