
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/21/3266357

141 Maiden Lane, Crayford, Dartford DA1 4NF

- 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 & Mrs J Durham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/02860/FUL, dated 3 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 December 2020.
 - The development is a proposed single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed single storey front extension at 141 Maiden Lane, Crayford, Dartford DA1 4NF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02860/FUL, dated 3 November 2020, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice refers to policies in the 2016 London Plan, which has been replaced with the 2021 version (LP). I shall have regard to this policy context in the determination of the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with off-street parking spaces to the front, sited on the western side of Maiden Lane. The surrounding area is residential in nature.
5. I note that the appeal dwelling is not locally or statutorily listed and the site is not located in a conservation area. There is no prevailing architectural style; the neighbourhood is characterised by dwellings of various size, appearance and detailing. There is no set building line on either side of the road, with the appeal property sited considerably further back from the public highway than the residence immediately to the north.

6. The proposed extension would infill the bay to the fore of the dwelling, and project beyond the existing front elevation by approximately 1.1 metres. It would incorporate a pitched roof similar to the first floor gable feature on the main house.
7. I consider that the enlargement would reflect the scale and proportions of the existing property. It would visually connect with the overall appearance of the dwelling, without dominating it or resulting in an imbalance, and respond to the original design features. The considerable variety of built form within the streetscene would ensure that the addition would assimilate without causing undue harm to the spatial quality of the area.
8. I note the advice contained in the Design and Development Control Guidelines 2004 (DDCG). Whilst the overall depth of the extension would be some 3.3 metres, the actual projection forward of the foremost elevation of the dwelling would be substantially less. The width of the proposal also does not significantly transcend the advice. Taken with my reasoning above, I am of the view that the appeal scheme would not result in any demonstrable harm that would warrant dismissal on these grounds.
9. I conclude that the proposal would not cause an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently it would comply with the requirements of policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan April 2004, policy CS05 of the Bexley Core Strategy Local Development Framework Development Plan Document February 2012, the DDCG and policy D4 of the LP. Collectively these policies seek to ensure proposals relate to surrounding development, meet high standards of design and protect the character of an area.

Conditions

10. 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, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawings is reasonable and necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition requiring external materials to match those on the existing dwelling would ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: Existing and Proposed Side Elevations (East), Existing and Proposed Front Elevations, Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plans, Existing and Proposed Side Elevations (West), Block Plan, Location Plan, Roof Plan
- 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing dwelling.