



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3239917

90 Pickford Lane, Bexleyheath, Kent DA7 4RT

- 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 Darren Rivett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 19/01530/FUL, dated 13 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension, single storey front extension and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension, single storey front extension and garage conversion at 90 Pickford Lane, Bexleyheath, Kent DA7 4RT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01530/FUL, dated 13 June 2019, subject to the conditions in the Schedule attached to this decision.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached, hipped-roof dwelling in a row of other houses similar in original form, but variously extended and altered over time, albeit retaining a generally cohesive character and appearance. The opposite side of the street is somewhat more mixed, with bungalows immediately opposite. The site lies on the corner of Pickford Lane and Hamilton Road, with an existing single-storey, attached garage and garden wall built along the footway edge of Hamilton Road. That road also has a consistency to the form, character and appearance of the dwellings along it. The proposal includes the use of materials and roof pitches to match those of the existing property.
4. The appeal proposal would, in effect, be forward of the established building line of the properties along Hamilton Road. However, given that there is already an attached, hipped-roof single-storey garage in the same position, I do not consider that the addition of an extra storey above it, even with the associated extra height, roof and overall scale, would have a significantly greater effect on the character and appearance of the area.

5. In my opinion, when viewed from Hamilton Road the appeal site and its neighbour across the junction do not appear to be part of, or contributing significantly to, the established character of Hamilton Road. The appeal site contributes more to the character of Pickford Lane, than to any sort of set-piece framing of the entrance to Hamilton Road. There are several examples in Pickford Lane of properties extended in a similar manner to the appeal proposal. I do not therefore consider that the corner location makes the appeal site or the appeal proposal unacceptably imposing or prominent.
6. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of examples similar to the appeal proposal, which I was able to see on my site visit. These have reinforced my conclusions that the houses on either side of junctions, and as found at this site in particular do not contribute so much to the character and appearance of the streets behind them that alterations would necessarily be harmful to that character and appearance.
7. I do not therefore consider that the appeal proposal would be unduly imposing, prominent, or out of character with the street scene and regular building lines of the area. The proposal would not therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. As such, it would comply with Policies ENV39, H3 and H9 of the 2004 Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development protects and enhances the quality of the built environment, is compatible with the character or appearance, scale, layout and massing of the surrounding area, and that extensions are compatible with the character of the existing buildings. The proposal would also accord with the guidance in the Bexley Council Design and Development Control Guidelines, which seek to add detail to the principles set out in the plan policies.

Conditions

9. Having had regard to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance I have imposed standard conditions concerning commencement (1), requiring the use of matching materials (2) and compliance with the submitted plans (3), in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

S Dean

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. That 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. That the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 90-PICKFORD-LANE 01 Rev A, 90-PICKFORD-LANE 02 Rev A.