
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2021

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/20/3262836
403 Abbey Road, Belvedere DA17 5DH

- 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 S. Makanjuola against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/01462/FUL, dated 26 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Demolish existing store house, erect part single part two storey rear and side extension to allow for conversion into two dwelling houses".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The Council's third reason for refusal followed from an objection from the Environment Agency (EA) in respect of flood risk. The EA has since withdrawn its objection and the Council has confirmed that it no longer wishes to defend refusal reason 3. As such the main issues are:
 - (i) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - (ii) the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with particular regard to car provision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house which is located in a suburban residential area. It forms part of a group of semi-detached and terraced houses of similar age and appearance. This gives the street scene a relatively unified appearance, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
4. The property includes a single storey storage building to the side. The proposal would comprise the removal of this building and erection of a 2-storey side extension that would extend beyond the rear elevation of the house. This, combined with a single-storey addition to the rear of the existing house, would enable the creation of a pair of dwellings. The dwelling within the side extension would be particularly narrow and cramped both in layout and

appearance. Due to its siting and size it would unbalance the symmetrical arrangement of the appeal property and its pair, 401 Abbey Road, and disrupt the generally unified appearance of the group.

5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. It therefore fails to accord with Saved Policies ENV39 and H3 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) which, amongst other matters, seek development that is of a high standard of design and compatible with the character of the surrounding area.

Highway Safety

6. The appeal property has a car parking area within the rear garden that is accessed via an unmetalled track off Fossington Road. It is not clear from the information before me whether this would or could be retained as part of the proposal or whether additional space would or could be provided for the extra dwelling proposed. As such the proposal would most likely give rise to additional demand for on-street car parking spaces in the area.
7. On-street parking spaces in the area appear to be well-used and/or subject to restrictions on their use. In the absence of a parking survey and/or details of on-site car parking it is not possible to establish the level of additional parking demand due to the proposal or its effect on parking stress and therefore on highway safety in the area. This is a matter that requires consideration at the application stage and cannot therefore be adequately overcome by the imposition of a planning condition.
8. It has not been adequately demonstrated that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on highway safety and therefore I must conclude that it is contrary to Policy T17 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan which states that applicants should make provision for off-street car parking spaces in their developments.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR