

Planning permission refusal – Appeal

Planning permission application - 242124

Although the side extension would abut to the house next door, the staggered building line of the properties would prevent any noticeable terracing effect in the street and the rhythm of the buildings would not be harmed. Setting the extension 1m away from the boundary, as required in the Borough Design Guide SPD, would not make any meaningful difference in the gap between the buildings when viewed from either side in the street.

The side extension would be set back from the front elevation and the ridge would be set down, to a similar design as the side extensions at No. 8, 16 and 34. The extension would therefore be consistent with the street scene.

The extension at No. 34 may have been permitted before the current local planning policies and guidance were adopted, however the character of the street would be the same then as it is now and the general policy requirements for good design and not causing harm to the character of the area are unlikely to have changed since then. If a two-storey side extension up to the boundary was acceptable then, then it would be unfair and unreasonable for our extension to be deemed harmful to the character of the area and the appearance of the semi-detached houses. It would also be unfair for us to be refused a very similar extension to our neighbour on the grounds that they built theirs first.

Overall, the side extension would be of an appropriate built form which maintains the character of the area comply with the aims and requirements of Core Strategy Policy CP1 and CP3, The Borough Design Guide SPD and section 12 of the NPPF. Subsequently, there would be no conflict with MDD Local Plan Policy CC01.