
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/21/3266778

17 Ravenswood, Bexley DA5 3NN

- 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 J Betham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/02757/FUL, dated 26 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 17 Ravenswood, Bexley DA5 3NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02757/FUL, dated 26 October 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 plan: 2020/108
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling. The rear elevation has been extended with a number of elements, including a ground floor conservatory and roof dormer window. The surrounding area is residential in nature with no prevailing architectural style; the neighbourhood is characterised by dwellings of various size, design and detailing.
4. The Council is concerned that the appeal proposal, in combination with the existing elements, would result in a large and discordant addition to the property that would be harmful in appearance to the host dwelling and detract from the original character of the surrounding area.

5. I am not persuaded that this would be the case. The proposed extension would have a similar rearward projection as the existing conservatory, and be lower in height. Whilst it would be wider, the enlarged section would sit centrally within the plot and a significant gap would be retained to the side boundary with No. 15 Ravenswood. I consider that the addition would harmonise with the existing rear elevation without appearing dominant or incongruous. Given its low level nature and reduced visibility, the impact is limited to the immediate surroundings and would have no adverse effect on the wider streetscene.
6. I therefore 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 CS01 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

7. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. To ensure a satisfactory appearance I impose a condition requiring the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

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

C Hall

INSPECTOR