



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2023

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3311821

57 Queenswood Road, Sidcup, Bexley DA15 8QP

- 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 Will Chidley against the decision of The London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02318/FUL, dated 12 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and addition of hipped roof over existing extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and addition of hipped roof over existing extension at 57 Queenswood Road, Sidcup, Bexley DA15 8QP, in accordance with the terms of the application 22/02318/FUL, dated 12 September 2022, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of development varies between documents submitted for the purpose of this appeal, I have used the one from the Council's decision notice as this most accurately and concisely describes the proposal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof. It has a good sized front garden given over mainly to hard paving for parking, with a planting bed to the front half of the garden. To the rear is a garden that is also of a good size and is mainly laid to lawn. The appeal dwelling has been the subject of existing single storey extensions to the rear, including a conservatory that also attaches to an outbuilding.

5. The appeal dwelling is located on a street made up of a mix of similarly sized detached bungalows and two storey semi-detached houses. To one side of the appeal property is a semi-detached two storey house, and to the other a private road to a flatted development, which is located to the rear of the appeal dwelling and two storey dwellings on the other side of the access road.
6. The proposal would extend the existing hipped roof form of the appeal dwelling over an already existing single storey flat roofed rear extension. It would also replace an existing rear conservatory extension, and an attached outbuilding, with a new single storey flat roofed extension with roof lantern. This proposed extension would be the full width of the appeal dwelling and would extend rearwards to the extent of the existing attached outbuilding.
7. The extension of the hipped roof rearward over an existing extension and the proposed full width extension would regularise the rear appearance of the appeal dwelling that is currently defined by the disparate designs of the existing extensions and attached outbuildings. This would be particularly apparent when viewed from the private access road and neighbouring rear gardens.
8. Although the proposal would result in a larger dwelling than existing, the architecturally sympathetic extension of the existing roof and rationalised appearance of the rear extensions would result in these additions appearing as a subordinate to the existing dwelling. The resulting extended appeal dwelling would be proportionate to the size of its plot and would reflect the scale and design of other properties in the area. As such, the proposal would accord with the Council's design guidance for extensions set out in Design and Development Control Guidelines 2, as appended to The Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004).
9. For these reasons the proposal would not appear as cramped on its site and would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area.

Other Matters

10. Concerns have been raised by an interested party with regard to the location of the proposed extension with reference to the party wall act. However, this constitutes a property and not a planning matter and not, therefore, one that I can give any significant weight to in my considerations.

Conditions

11. As well as requiring compliance with approved plans and the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, to ensure design quality I have applied a condition requiring materials to be used for the proposal to match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR