



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 03 August 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3243585

64 Hill Crescent, Bexley, DA5 2DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Blyth against the decision of London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02196/FUL dated 27 August 2019 was refused by notice dated 27 November 2019.
 - The proposed development is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension at 64 Hill Crescent, Bexley, DA5 2DB, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 19/02196/FUL, dated 27 August 2019, and 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 plan: 2019/101

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council's Officer report refers to the neighbouring property as No.60. However, it is evident from my site visit and the description of the property within the Officer report, that the neighbouring property, and the dwelling which they have concerns about the effect on, is No.66. I have therefore based my decision according to this.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
- The effect of the proposed development upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 66 Hill Crescent, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site accommodates a large detached dwelling. The house appears as a dormer bungalow from the front, but the rearward projection of the dwelling is two storeys with a mansard roof. There is a side garage/utility room that aligns with the dwelling at the front and abuts the boundary with No.66. The dwelling at No.66 is a modest sized hipped roof bungalow that is set in a small distance from the boundary it shares with the appeal site. Overall, the distances between the built forms vary along Hill Crescent. Also, the houses along this road differ in style and design. As such, there is no strong sense of uniformity.
6. The proposal is a two-storey side extension. The front portion of the development would align with the gable roof of the host dwelling and incorporate a dormer to match the existing. The rearward portion of the proposal would be a flat roof. Both roof forms respect the existing dwelling in terms of design, with the flat roof complementing the flat section of the mansard roof. The siting would predominantly be the same as the existing side development.
7. Due to the hipped roof and single storey nature of the dwelling at No.66, the proposal would not wholly eradicate the space between both dwellings and a significant gap would remain. Overall, the proposal would not appear incongruous in the street scene by virtue of the various styles of dwellings with different gaps in between built forms witnessed on Hill Crescent.
8. Although the proposal would not meet the requirements of a 1m set in from the side boundary and setback from the front as set out within the Design and Development Control Guidelines, (Guidelines), the development would not fail to comply with the overall aim of the design principles within the Guidelines which are to ensure developments respect the character of the existing building.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. I therefore do not find conflict with Saved Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan, Adopted 28 April 2004, which seek to ensure developments are compatible with the character of the surrounding area and the existing building. Also, no conflict is found with Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to promote good design. Further, no conflict is found with Policy CS02 of the Bexley Core Strategy, Adopted 22 February 2012, as it does not relate to this part of Bexley.

Living Conditions

10. The proposed development would not go beyond the depth of the existing utility room. It would go beyond the rear wall of the dwelling at No.66, but not by a large distance. A gap would also remain between the two dwellings and

albeit small, this, together with the limited rearward projection, would mean the proposal would not be overbearing to the occupiers of No.66 or affect the outlook from their rear facing windows.

11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.66 having regard to outlook. I therefore do not find conflict with Policy H9 of the UDP which also seeks to ensure developments do not have affect the amenity of residents of adjoining properties.

Conditions

12. In the interests of certainty, a condition is necessary to ensure the development is carried in accordance with the approved plans and within three years of the date of this decision. Furthermore, in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary to ensure matching materials are used.
13. The Council's Officer report states a condition would be required to ensure the first-floor side window is obscured glazed. However, as the window would primarily face the roof of the bungalow at No. 66, this condition is not considered necessary.

Recommendation and Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend the appeal is allowed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. 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