



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3313573

206 Halfway Street, Sidcup, DA15 8DW.

- 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 Penny against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 22/02382/FUL, dated 20 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is for roof extensions to allow for accommodation within the roof space and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The London Borough of Bexley–Bexley Local Plan was adopted by the Council on 26 April 2023 (Local Plan). This has replaced the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 28 April 2004) and the London Borough of Bexley Local Development Framework Development Plan Document *Bexley Core Strategy* (Adopted 22 February 2012), such that the policies cited on the decision notice are no longer part of the development plan and have no weight. I have therefore determined the appeal having regard to the relevant policies within the Local Plan. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on this during the appeal.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and the wider street scene, and;
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers of number 204 and 208 in terms of its potential to appear overbearing, overshadowing and a sense of enclosure and loss of outlook to number 204.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 206 Halfway Street is a detached bungalow. It is located in a mixed residential/commercial street. It sits on a relatively large garden plot and has been extended so that it has a larger footprint than the three neighbouring bungalows, No's 200 to 204, to the south-east. The neighbouring

dwelling to the north-west, No 208, was, before being converted to a large two storey chalet style dwelling, of a similar design and form to No 206.

5. The neighbouring dwellings, along with those opposite are a mix of detached and semi-detached houses.

Character and appearance

6. The appellant proposes removing the existing hipped roof and forming a mansard style roof with six dormer windows to provide new first floor accommodation. It is also proposed to demolish the existing large rear extension and construct a full width single storey addition with a flat roof and pitched tiled facias.
7. Given the previous alterations and additions to number 208 the overall size of the plot, the two-storey houses close by and the mixed development in the road I consider that enlargement of the bungalow could be acceptable in principle.
8. However, the mansard style roof and the pitched facias would give the building as extended a somewhat bulky, dumpy, unattractive and utilitarian appearance. In addition, the intersection of the mansard and pitched fascia roof, would due the difference in the proposed roof pitches appear awkward and contrived.
9. Accordingly, and while having regard to the vernacular hipped and gable roof design of nearby properties I consider that the proposed mansard and pitched fascia design of the new roofs would appear incongruous in the context of the host property and obtrusive in the street scene.
10. For these reasons I conclude in respect of the first main issue that the proposed development, by reason of its overall scale, bulk, design and appearance, would constitute an unsympathetic and incongruous development which would be harmful to the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and thereby character and appearance of the wider street scene.
11. To allow the development would therefore be contrary to, Local Plan Policies SP1, SP5 and DP11, as they seek, amongst other things, to secure good design for new development.

Living conditions

No 208 Halfway Street:

12. No 208 is located to the north-west of No 206. From the evidence I note that the separation distance between the two properties as extended would be about 3.7 metres. The mansard roof would project further behind the dwelling than the existing hipped roof and while the proposed rear extension would be the same depth as the existing rear projection, it would, by reason of the pitched fascia design be higher. Nevertheless, given the relationship of one dwelling to the other and their orientation I am not persuaded that the proposed additions to no 206 would either appear so overbearing or result in such a significant level of overshadowing as to cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 208.

No 204 Halfway Street:

13. This bungalow is located to the south-east of No 206. I note from the evidence before me that the separation distance of the existing flank walls is just some 0.8 metres. Further, the proposed single storey addition would project some 9.0 metres or so further into the rear garden at a height of some 3.2 metres.
14. On balance and having regard to the small rear garden of No 204 and the overall bulk and massing of the proposed addition I consider that it would result in such an increased sense of enclosure for the residents of No 204 as to cause harm to their living conditions.
15. I conclude in respect of the second main issue that the proposed development would not be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 208. However, it would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 204. In this respect, the proposal as designed would be contrary to the aims of Local Plan Policies SP1, SP5 and DP11 as they seek to protect residential living conditions.

Other Matters

16. The appellant has referred me to other nearby rear extensions, including that to No 208 (Ref:21/01272/FUL). Whatever the background to those cases, their existence is not an appropriate justification for permitting the development here, which I have considered on its individual planning merits.
17. I note that it is proposed that the extension would be built from materials and finishes to match the host property, which I agree with the appellant would be appropriate in this case. However, the absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations and, as such, I have given this matter very little weight in my deliberations.

Conclusions

18. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR