

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2017

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/17/3173867

42 Broomfield Road, Bexleyheath, DA6 7PA

- 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 Michael Cherrington against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 16/03133/FUL, dated 19 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension and single storey rear extension at 42 Broomfield Road, Bexleyheath, DA6 7PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/03133/FUL, dated 19 December 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three 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.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, A16/161/01 & /02RevC.

Preliminary Matter

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the application form; I note the Appellant also uses this on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a visually agreeable semi-detached two storey dwelling with a cat slide roof and a forward projecting ground floor element. The established residential neighbourhood is characterised by primarily semi-detached residential properties of varied type and design which come together
-

to form an area of pleasing suburban appearance. The appeal proposal is as described above.

5. The Council cites conflict with saved Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan (2004) (UDP) and its Design and Development Control Guideline 2 (DDCG). In broad terms, taken together and amongst other matters, these call for suitably scaled high quality design of development sympathetic to a site's wider setting and ensuring protection of local distinctiveness and character generally, along with protection of the aesthetics of a host property.
6. The cat slide side roof arrangement found on the appeal property is seen on a number of pairs of semi-detached homes locally and is an attractive feature when in balance such that significant change to one home would be visually damaging to the symmetry of the pair. However in this instance the change has already taken place on the adjoining property and thus the cat slide itself on the appeal property becomes less 'precious'. Indeed whilst not precisely matching in form the planned works would actually lead to symmetry being re-created at first floor window level.
7. The Council understandably normally seeks a set-back for a side extensions to help secure the sense of subordination but each case must be taken on its merits and here, at first floor, matters would be reflective across the pair. Furthermore the fact that the ground floor front element both at present and as planned projects forward of the upper level provides an element of interest and articulation. There is a sense of space around the property to accommodate the additional mass and some reduction of public views diagonally towards the non-attached neighbouring home, with its arrangement of extension works, would not be harmful. The planned hipped roof form would be substantial but would not appear jarring to the eye and in this instance I would see no need for a step-in or step-down to continue to afford a dwelling of reasonable appearance in its own right, and as one of a pair, and within the streetscene as a whole.
8. Given all of the above I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to the policies I refer to in paragraph 5 and furthermore, there would not be conflict with the *objectives* of the DDCG which reflects these policy aims and cannot be expected to have content to cover every situation in detail.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on living conditions for neighbours. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR