The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2017

by Patrick Whelan BA(Hons) Dip Arch MA MSc ARB RIBA RTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/17/3175512
72 St. Audrey Avenue, Bexleyheath

- 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 P Saunders against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
- The application Ref 16/03245/FUL, received by the Council on 15 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2017.
- The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 72 St. Audrey Avenue, Bexleyheath in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/03245/FUL, received by the Council on 15 December 2016, and the plan 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan 2016/262 FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION.

    3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. These are the effect of the proposed development on:

    - the living conditions of the occupiers of 74 St. Audrey Avenue, with particular regard to light; and

    - the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions of the occupiers of 74 St. Audrey Avenue

3. Given that the kitchen window of No 74 is in the flank wall directly opposite the appeal house, the proposal would not reduce the daylight or sunlight entering that room over the existing condition to a harmful degree. The living room window of No 74 would be opposite the proposed extension which would reduce the daylight and south-west sunlight it receives. However, this is a secondary opening, with the main source of light opening to the east through glazed doors

with side-lights. The impact of the proposal would not be so great as to harm the enjoyment of light and sunlight within that room. The proposal may increase the overshadowing of the garden of No 74 in the afternoon. However, given the length of the garden, the distance of the proposal to its south-west, as well as the effect of the existing roof over the appeal house, the additional overshadowing from the development would not be materially harmful.

4. I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 74 St. Audrey Avenue, with particular regard to light. There would be no conflict with Core Strategy 2012 policy CS01 which concerns the health and well-being of the community and saved policies ENV39 and H9 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2004 which say that development should not adversely affect the amenity of adjoining properties including in terms of daylight and sunlight.

Character and appearance of the area

5. I appreciate that the neighbouring house to the north is a bungalow which would give the proposed extension greater exposure than the similar extensions on the other houses in the street which are screened by their 2-storey neighbours. However, there are examples of flat, hipped and pyramid roofs over similar extensions in the same section of the street. In this context the proposed roof would not appear out of character with the roofscape in the street, nor would its design in its own right be incompatible with the existing roof over the house.

6. The proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with Core Strategy 2012 policy CS01 which concerns sustainable development and saved policies ENV39 and H9 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2004 which require extensions to be of a high standard of design, compatible with the character of adjacent buildings.

Conditions and Conclusion

7. In the interests of proper planning and for the avoidance of doubt, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plan. In order to safeguard the appearance of the host dwelling and the area, a condition requiring the extension to be built in materials which would match the existing dwelling is also attached.

8. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Patrick Whelan

INSPECTOR