



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3248544
23 Stream Way, Belvedere, DA17 6ND

- 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 Paul Beesley against the decision of London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02536/FUL, dated 21 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is rear two storey and single storey extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear two-storey and single storey extensions at 23 Stream Way, Belvedere, DA17 6ND, in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/02536/FUL, dated 21 October 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Drawing Nos. 23SW/2019/02 and 23SW/2019/01 Rev A.
 - 3) 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.

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 proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 24 Stream Way, with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached property on the southern side of Stream Way. The appeal dwelling currently has a small rear

extension which abuts the boundary with 24 Stream Way. The proposal would result in a part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension. The Council raise no objection to the single-storey part of the proposal and I have no reason to come to a different view.

5. The double storey part of the proposal would project rearwards of the existing house by around 5 metres and would be distanced from the common boundary with No.24 by approximately 2 metres. Although the Council raised concerns regarding the effect of the development on the neighbouring property's first floor window with regards to loss of outlook, I find that the separation distance between the proposal and the window in question is sufficient enough to limit any adverse impact. I accept that the view to the east and south-east from the first floor window of No.24 would be altered as a result of the proposal however the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling would still enjoy a pleasant and open aspect to the south overlooking an adequately-sized rear garden.
6. Furthermore, given the shallow pitch of the extension's roof, the relationship between the properties I viewed on site, and the orientation of the buildings, I am satisfied that there would be no significant loss of sunlight or daylight as a result of the proposed development.
7. It is also considered that the proposed height and depth of the development would not be excessive. Overall, the development would not have an intrusive or overbearing visual impact upon the rear elevation of No. 24 and so would not harmfully change the outlook from the rear of No.24, or affect the light received by No. 24.
8. Given the above, I therefore find the development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No.24, with regard to outlook and light. The proposed development would accord with Policies ENV39 and H9 of Bexley's Unitary Development Plan (the 'Local Plan') as well as the Design and Development Control Guideline 2 which together seek to ensure that extensions and alterations do not adversely affect the amenity of residents of adjoining properties.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to the neighbour's comments regarding the appellant's Design & Access Statement submitted with the original application. Whilst they query the need for the extension with respect to the accommodation already available, as I have found the extension to be acceptable in planning terms, the need for it is not a matter that has had a bearing on my decision.
10. Furthermore, the neighbours at 24 Stream Way highlighted there are no other two-storey extensions on Stream Way and that the proposal would set a precedent for similar development. However any future proposals would be assessed on their own merits.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. 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