



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: 07 May 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3263200

3 Northumberland Way, Erith, Kent DA8 3NT

- 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 Breeds against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/01833/FUL, dated 29 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a ground and part first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a ground and part first floor rear extension at 3 Northumberland Way, Erith, Kent DA8 3NT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01833/FUL, dated 29 July 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: SDSL-LB-0000 P1; SDSL-LB-0002 P1; SDSL-LB-000S P1.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of 1 Northumberland Way, with particular regard to outlook and natural light.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey house. It forms part of a characterful terrace of 4 houses with prominent gables at the front and half-dormers to the front and rear. Whilst the end properties in the terrace include 2-storey rear wings, the appeal property and the other mid terrace house have flat rear elevations.
4. The proposal would comprise a 2-storey rear addition. The ground floor would extend to the side boundaries whereas the upper floor would be set away from

both boundaries. This element would have a hipped roof and a garden facing half-dormer.

5. There is a first floor bedroom window at the rear of 1 Northumberland Way that mirrors the position of the existing bedroom window in the appeal property. These windows are within half-dormers with their centre points just above eaves level. They are also set away from the shared boundary between the 2 properties. As only the hipped roof of the proposal would be above the level of neighbouring window, I am satisfied that any reductions in natural light to, and outlook from, the bedroom window would be small and adequate levels of light and outlook would be maintained with the proposal in place.
6. The proposal would have a small impact on natural light reaching the rooflight in the single-storey rear addition at No.1. As the ground floor of this property includes rear-facing windows I am satisfied that adequate natural light would also be maintained at ground floor level. I am also satisfied that the proposal would have minimal effect on light to, and outlook from, 5 Northumberland Way.
7. For these reasons I conclude the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.1. It therefore accords with Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) which, amongst other matters, state that development should not adversely affect the amenity of residents of adjoining properties.

Other Matters

8. Neighbouring residents have expressed concern that the proposed development would reduce the value of their properties. *Planning Practice Guidance*¹ indicates that the planning system is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests, such as the impact of a development on the value of a neighbouring property, are not material considerations.

Conditions

9. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR

¹ Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306