



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3254098

112 Elsa Road, Welling DA16 1JT

- 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 Woods against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00645/FUL, dated 15 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is Demolition of existing garage and Erection of first floor rear bathroom extension and single storey 6.0m deep rear extension at 112 Elsa Road DA16 1JT.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Demolition of existing garage and Erection of first floor rear bathroom extension and single storey 6.0m deep rear extension at 112 Elsa Road, Welling, DA16 1JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00645/FUL, dated 15 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: location plan, block plan, 101 existing plans and elevations drawing ref 101, proposed plans and elevations drawing ref 301.
 - 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 dwelling.
 - 4) The side window to the bathroom extension shall be obscurely glazed before the extension comes into use and retained for the lifetime of the development.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is semi-detached with an existing small extension to part of the rear elevation. This would be removed to erect a single storey extension the full width of the host dwelling with a small first floor bathroom extension above part of this.

4. The ground floor element would project close to the party boundary with 110 Elsa Road. This neighbour has extended to the rear and the side of this extension forms part of the party boundary. A boundary fence of approximately 2m extends to the far end of the garden.
5. Given an extension exists to the neighbour's side, with a wide glazed door facing the garden, a projection beyond it of approximately 3m would not unduly compromise their outlook. The proposal would be seen above the timber fence, however, the use of a flat roof would ensure it appears less pronounced within this location, further lessening its impact on the living conditions of the attached neighbour.
6. The rear elevations along this side of Elsa Road contains a variety of extensions, of differing designs and sizes, as well as a large box style dormer window visible. There is no prevailing consistency to the rear elevations of the houses. Outbuildings in gardens also contributes to the variety of visible development to the rear. The proposal would be seen from other private gardens, however, the use of matching materials and flat roof design would ensure the proposal harmonises with the host dwelling. It would therefore not appear as an incongruous feature.
7. The proposed first floor rear extension would be small in scale and broadly characteristic of other first floor extensions.
8. To conclude, I find no harm would arise to the character and appearance of the area or to the living conditions of neighbours as a result of the proposal. It would therefore comply with Policy H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004 in its design and amenity aims, and Policy ENV39 to protect the built environment.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. I have considered conditions in light of the Planning Practice Guidance and Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition relating to the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty, and a condition in relation to materials is reasonable in order to protect the character and appearance of the area. Obscurely glazing the side window of the proposed bathroom is necessary to protect the living conditions of the adjacent neighbour.
10. Should the flat roof become used as external space for the occupiers, this would change its use with the need for separate permission, and therefore there is no requirement to impose a condition to this end.
11. For the reasons above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR