



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3242919

11 Burns Avenue, Sidcup DA15 9HL

- 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 A Simpson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
- The application Ref 19/02152/FUL, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2019.
- The proposed development is single storey front porch and internal alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front porch and internal alterations at 11 Burns Avenue, Sidcup DA15 9HL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02152/FUL, dated 2 September 2019, 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 buildings.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site Location Plan at 1:1250 scale, 010919/1 of 4 Existing Ground and First Floor Plans, 010919/2 of 4 Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans, 010919/3 of 4 Existing and Proposed Elevations and 010919/4 of 4 Section.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey, end-of-terrace dwelling on the western side of Burns Avenue. Properties along Burns Avenue feature front canopies, front porches and side porches of varied scale and design. While the proposed porch would extend beyond the bay window of the appeal property, I
-

saw during my site visit that the front porch of No 17, situated a short distance to the north of the appeal site, also steps forward of its bay window. Given the close proximity of a directly comparable development at No 17 and considering the variety of porches seen along the street, the proposal would not appear particularly incongruous or prominent within the streetscene and so would therefore be acceptable on this basis.

5. I acknowledge that the proposal would exceed the recommended dimensions for porches as stated in the Design and Development Control Guideline 2. However, this document also states that front extensions of a greater depth than a porch may be acceptable for houses in streets with irregular building lines. As there is some variety in the building lines along either side of Burns Avenue such that the proposal would not appear to materially project forward of the general building line on this side of the road, I consider that the proposal would comply with this document.
6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the street. The proposed development would therefore comply with Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Saved Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Policy CS06 of the Core Strategy (2012), which state, amongst other things, that proposals must be designed to a high standard and must respond positively to the character of the surrounding area. The proposal would also comply with Design and Development Control Guideline 2 for the reasons set out above.

Conditions

7. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council, with due regard given to the advice on imposing conditions as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and the National Planning Practice Guidance.
8. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I agree that a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans is necessary in the interests of clarity. I also agree that a condition relating to materials is necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the street.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR