
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2021

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3267724

92 Penhill Road, Bexley DA5 3EL

- 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 Dida against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/02670/FUL, dated 18 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is a part one, part two storey side and rear extension and formation of rooms in roofspace incorporating dormer windows to rear and side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part one, part two storey side and rear extension and formation of rooms in roofspace incorporating dormer windows to rear and side at 92 Penhill Road, Bexley DA5 3EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02670/FUL, dated 18 October 2020, and the plans submitted with it (site plan, block plan, C-01 Existing and Proposed Plans and Elevations, C-02 Proposed Floor Plans and Sections).

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description from the Council's decision notice, rather than the original planning application form or appeal form, as it better describes the proposal.
3. At my site visit, I saw that the development has been completed and I note that the application has been submitted retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with off-street parking spaces to the front, sited on Penhill Road opposite the junction with Bladindon Drive. The surrounding area is residential in nature with no prevailing architectural style; the neighbourhood is characterised by dwellings of various size, design and detailing.

6. I consider that the side dormer reflects the scale and proportions of the existing property. It is small, with a pitched roof and visually connects with the overall appearance of the dwelling, without being imposing or resulting in an imbalance with the adjoining semi-detached property.
7. The side dormer's impact is limited to the immediate surroundings. The considerable variety in the appearance of houses in the area ensures that the addition would assimilate without causing undue harm to the spatial quality of the area. Myriad roof shapes and styles are evident in the street scene, including a further side dormer similar to that proposed by this appeal to the south, on the outside bend of Penhill Road.
8. I note that the Council does not object to the other additions to the property at the rear and I have no reason to disagree. They appear to harmonise with the dwelling in relation to depth, width, height and overall design.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. It would comply with the requirements of policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan April 2004, the Design and Development Control Guidelines 2004 and policy CS05 of the Bexley Core Strategy Local Development Framework Development Plan Document February 2012. Cumulatively these policies seek to ensure proposals relate to surrounding development, meet high standards of design and protect the character of an area. It would also be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. The development is complete and therefore the standard time limit and plans condition are no longer necessary. I am satisfied that no conditions are required.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR