



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2020

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3253836
64 Penhill Road, Bexley, Kent, DA5 3EN

- 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 Para Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/00322/FUL, dated 6 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part single/part double storey side/rear extension and porch to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single/part double storey side/rear extension and porch to front at 64 Penhill Road, Bexley, Kent, DA5 3EN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/00322/FUL, dated 6 February 2020, 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 plans: MKM/20/PEN64/PL01 01/03, MKM/20/PEN64/PL01 02/03 & MKM/20/PEN64/PL01 03/03.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house in an established suburban residential area. I saw at my site visit that many properties have been extended and altered over the years, including side extensions.
 4. The proposed works to the property would see a side extension that is set-back at first floor and in the front roof slope, with the ridgeline also being set down from the main building. These design features provide a suitable degree of subservience between the extension and the original house.
 5. The appeal property (and its attached pair No. 62) is set at a slight angle to its neighbouring pair of Nos. 66 & 68. This means that the proposed side
-

extension would have a degree of visual containment when seen along the street: it would be slightly 'tucked behind' the building line. This further reduces any visual presence of the proposed extension, and mitigates against any concern regarding the width of the extension, as raised by the Council. I also noted at my site visit that both the adjoining properties of Nos. 62 and 66 have wide two storey extensions. The proposal at No. 64 would thus be seen in this context and appear entirely appropriate in terms of its width, scale and massing.

6. The proposed porch and alterations at ground floor would be minor changes to the property that reflect alterations seen at other houses in the area, including at the adjoining house. The scale and design of the extensions to the rear would similarly be appropriate to the host property and reflect that seen in the vicinity.
7. On the main issue it is therefore concluded that the proposed development would have no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would represent a development whose design and external appearance is of high quality and reflects the area, and so is consistent with the objectives of Policies H9 and ENV39 of the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004), and Policy CS01 of the London Borough of Bexley Core Strategy (2012).
8. The proposed extension would be largely contained within the existing space between No. 64 and No. 66. The rearward projection of the extension at ground floor would adjoin the extensions at No. 66 and No. 62 and not have any impact upon the outlook from those houses. Due to the angled siting of No. 64 and the space retained to the boundary, the proposed first floor extension would be sufficiently distanced from No. 66 to ensure no overbearing impact or loss of light to that property.
9. The appeal is therefore allowed. I have attached a condition requiring matching materials, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR