



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3242134

16 Eversley Avenue, Bexleyheath DA7 6RB

- 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 I Mpanga against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 19/01996/FUL, dated 26 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side and single storey rear extension at 16 Eversley Road, Bexleyheath DA7 6RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01996/FUL, dated 26 July 2019, 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 following approved plans: DH19/106/01 Rev A, DH19/106/02 Rev A, DH19/106/03 Rev A, DH19/106/04 Rev A, DH19/106/05 Rev A, DH19/106/06 Rev A, DH19/106/07 Rev A, DH19/106/Site Location Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of the proposed development has been taken from the appeal form rather than the application form as it is a more accurate description of the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a link attached single storey garage on the side elevation of the property. The surrounding area is residential in nature largely made up of semi-detached pairs that are similar in appearance to the appeal property. The proposed development would replace the existing single storey attached garage with a two-storey side extension along with a single storey rear extension. It was noted during the site visit that many of the surrounding dwellings have undertaken similar extensions in place of the existing garages to provide additional habitable accommodation.
6. The proposed two storey side extension would have the same ridge height as the current dwelling and would not be set back any further than the existing garage. The proposal is large in size and would nearly double the width of the first floor and therefore could not necessarily be considered a subservient addition. However the proposed design and style matches that of the existing property and other dwellings within the streetscene. A number of nearby properties, including No.18, have similar extensions of this size and appearance. The Council suggest that these were undertaken before current policy was introduced or were granted permission more recently to balance the appearance of pairs of semi-detached dwellings. However, these extended dwellings still form part of the character and appearance of the area and provide the visual context in which the proposal would be seen. Accordingly, the proposed extension would not be at odds with the area's prevailing character. I acknowledge that the proposal would alter the visual balance of the semi-detached pair, but nonetheless the appeal property is contained within a linear group of similar dwellings and is no more prominent than other dwellings along Eversley Road. In the context that I have described and having regard to its consistent form and design, the scale of the development would not appear dominant or incongruous within its surroundings.
7. The Design and Development Control Guideline 2 (2004) states that two storey side extensions should be designed to be subordinate to the main dwelling, incorporating a set-back of the front elevation of the extension and lowering the ridge line. Although the proposal would be contrary to this guidance, it would not be at odds with its objective to ensure that extensions respect the character of the existing building and adjacent building.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would not be in conflict with Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy (2012) which seek to ensure residential development is compatible with the character of existing buildings and the surrounding area and that family housing is retained and, where possible, improved. The proposal would also comply with the design objectives within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of

materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusions and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR