



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: 25 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3241957

65 Holmesdale Road, DA7 4TJ

- 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 Song Nguyen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 19/01914/FUL, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the single storey rear extension on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the area;
 - b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling, No.67 Holmesdale Road, with regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which is also adjoined to the other neighbouring property, No.63 Holmesdale Road, at ground floor level. It currently has a timber clad, single storey extension with a flat roof, across the full width of the rear elevation of the dwelling, which is the subject of this appeal. Therefore, the appeal is retrospective in nature.
5. The Design and Development Control Guideline 2 states that on semi-detached houses, single storey extensions at the rear and on the boundary with the adjoining half of the property, should not normally exceed 3.5 metres in depth from the rear of the property. The extension is some 40cm in excess of this guideline and combined with its full width results in a large and dominant addition to the rear of the property. The visual impact of the development is

also exacerbated by the external materials used, which are of poor quality and predominantly timber which does not match or complement the main dwelling. This results in a development which has a harmful impact on the appearance of the rear of the property, and which detracts from the pleasant quality of the surrounding environment.

6. Consequently, the scale and appearance of the rear extension has a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area and is contrary to Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan (2004) which both seek to ensure new development is compatible with the character of existing buildings and the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

7. The adjoining property, No.67 Holmesdale Road, does not have a rear extension and therefore the depth and proximity of the development appears as a significant protrusion of built form alongside the boundary. However, No.67 has a large garden space which would be mostly unaffected, and views of the extension are also somewhat restricted by the boundary fence and existing foliage within the neighbouring garden. In these circumstances there would not be a significant overshadowing impact or any unacceptable harm to the outlook from the majority of the neighbouring garden. Nonetheless, the extension would be prominent from the first-floor windows of neighbouring properties. Having regard to the unsympathetic scale and appearance of the extension, it is a visually intrusive form of development, in particular for the occupiers of No 67. The development therefore results in a less attractive environment and a poor quality outlook for the neighbouring residents.
8. For the above reasons, the development has a harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and conflicts with Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan (2004) which seeks to ensure new development does not adversely affect the amenity of residents of adjoining properties, including outlook.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has stated that the rear extension is permitted development and therefore they are not obliged to submit a planning application for the development. No further evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the extension would fall under permitted development rights and therefore I do not give this any significant weight.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

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 dismissed.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR