
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/20/3263458
176 Gipsy Road, Welling, Kent DA16 1JQ

- 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 V Boopathi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/01747, dated 21 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part one, part two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house. It is situated in a residential street and forms part of a group of houses of similar age and appearance. Although some of the properties have been extended, the gaps between the pairs of houses have generally been retained. This gives the group of semi-detached houses a significant degree of unity, which contributes to the character of the street scene: a matter to which I attach significant weight.
4. A single-storey rear extension has recently been added to the property. This extends beyond the side building line of the house to the side boundary and extends a significant distance into the rear garden. The appeal proposal would have a smaller footprint than this recently constructed addition but would be predominantly 2-storey and would also extend beyond the side elevation of the house to the side boundary. Due to its height and siting this would be an overly prominent, cumbersome and alien form of development that would be at odds with the appearance of the neighbouring house and harmful to the appearance of the host property.
5. The appellant has advised that the appeal proposal replicates a scheme granted planning permission in 2015 (ref:15/01774/FUL). I note that this scheme was deemed to accord with the same local policies that remain in place today.

However, since 2015 a new London Plan (2021) has been adopted and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and National Design Guide (2021) published by the government. In particular, paragraphs 124 and 130 of the Framework which state that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.

6. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to the Framework, the aims of the National Design Guide and Policy D3 of the London Plan. The latter states that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR