

---

# 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/20/3265915**

**41 Myrtle Close, Erith DA8 3PT**

- 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 Edwards against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
  - The application Ref 20/01965/FUL, dated 10 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2020.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension and internal alterations.
- 

## 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 existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with off-street parking spaces to the front, sited on Myrtle Close. The surrounding area is residential in nature and comprises houses of relatively similar scale and design.
  4. The proposal would extend to the side and would incorporate a pitched roof similar to the main house. It would be set back from the front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling, and the ridgeline would be below that of the host property.
  5. Although the proposed addition would therefore have elements of subservience, its overall width would be comparative to the current residence. Moreover, the site is situated on a prominent bend within the Myrtle Close streetscene.
  6. From my observations, the width of the extension would result in an arrangement that would be over-dominant in its relationship to the existing building, and would not therefore be sufficiently subordinate to it. Accordingly, the proposed addition would compete with the original dwelling rather than complement it. This arrangement would also appear out of keeping with the character of the surroundings, and represent a jarring and conspicuous intrusion into the neighbourhood.
-

7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. It would contravene policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan April 2004 and the Design and Development Control Guidelines 2004, which seek to ensure proposals relate to surrounding development, are of appropriate design and protect the character of an area.

### **Conclusion**

8. Having taken full account of all of the matters before me, the appeal fails.

*C Hall*

INSPECTOR