



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2021

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3263998

9 Manor Way, Bexley DA5 3QF

- 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 M Cleary against the decision of London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02230/FUL, dated 9 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2020.
 - The development was for single storey rear extension and single storey side extension .
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension and single storey side extension at 9 Manor Way, Bexley in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 20/02230/FUL, dated 9 September 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 9-MANOR-WAY-02 Rev A dated 19 August 2020.
 - ii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - iii) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of four similar houses within Manor Way that exhibit interesting architectural details that I consider would be synonymous with the Arts and Crafts style of architecture. The properties generally present a gable to their frontages with a small half hip to the peak of the roof and a mix of materials ranging from render, to Mock Tudor boarding and tile hung elements to the upper parts of the primary elevation. These details, together with the

bay and sliding sash windows, rusticated plinth level and pilasters give the properties distinctive characteristics.

4. To the rear the properties appear to have partial one and two storey outshot type extensions that extend along around one half of the width of the property. Although several of these extensions have been modified, I have evidence before me that such extensions were original to this row of houses.
5. I saw on my site visit that the existing dormer window to the appeal property appeared to have been inserted into a sloping roof that was similar to the roof form of the adjacent building at number 11. Moreover, I consider that the form of such an extension, and the use of what appeared to be original rosemary tiles to its roof, would be consistent with a building of this type and age. I therefore consider it highly likely that the original extent of the building did in fact project as far into the rear garden as the property currently does now.
6. In light of this, I consider that the proposed extension would extend only by around 4m from the original rear elevation of the house. It would also infill the gap between this original outshot and the property's southern boundary. This would include the infill of the small cut out adjacent to the property's Dining Room which I understand is not a contentious element of this appeal in any case.
7. In assessing the design, massing and extent of the proposed extension therefore I give great weight to the Council's aspirations for good, contextual design. In this case, the proposed extension would be of a differing architectural style to that of the main house, but I consider such a contrast would be appropriate in this context and would not appear incongruous. Rather the contrast in architectural style would have the effect of enabling the history of the host property to be better understood through a clearly modern extension being constructed.
8. In light of my findings above, I do not consider that the extension would represent as great a projection to the rear as the Council believes. However there would still be a significant addition to the original property. I consider however that the flat roof nature of the extension and height of around 2.75m would be sufficient to mitigate any harm to the existing building or to the surrounding streetscene from where some of the extension may, at certain times of the year, be partially visible.
9. In summary I conclude that the proposal before me would not overwhelm, appear incongruous or be out of scale with the host property or its neighbours.
10. As such I consider the intentions included within Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy, policies HE9 and ENV39 of the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan (saved), and the guidance within The Design and Development Control Guidance 2 all of which seek to ensure that new developments are of a high quality standard of design and responsive to context, are met.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions outlined above.

A Graham

INSPECTOR