



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/20/3264583

137 Upton Road, Bexleyheath DA6 8LS

- 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 Woolley against the decision of London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01959/FUL, dated 12 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2020.
 - The development is for first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development is the same as this description and neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that this description is erroneous. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the Council's decision notice and the Appellant's appeal form.
3. The new London Plan was formally adopted on the 2 March 2021, after the appeal was submitted. In these circumstances, although there are no directly comparable policies to those used in the original decision, I am required to determine the appeal against the current development plan for the area at the time of my decision which I have done.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi detached house on the corner of Upton Road and Lion Road. The property forms part of one of three pairs of semi detached houses located along this part of Upton Road all of which sport typical hipped roofs and brick and render materials to their elevations. Although the overall character of the area is relatively varied, I consider that the three pairs of

houses here form a cohesive element of townscape that are visually similar to one another.

6. The existing house sits on a corner plot with a large, mature tree being located to the rear of the plot and several timber structures abutting the side boundary fence. The property also contains an existing attached ground floor side extension. I consider that this extension is unusual in its footprint, form and in its use of protruding skylights that give the existing extension an element of complexity and interest, setting it apart from the ordinary.
7. The proposal, through its intention to extend this ground floor structure with a new first floor element is therefore somewhat constrained in its design by the need to respond to the unusual footprint of this existing extension. The result will be a new first floor with several areas where this new storey will overhang the existing ground floor. This will create an awkward relationship with the existing extension, the main house and the streetscene and will have the effect of enlarging the built form on this corner to a substantial degree.
8. Added to this, the proposal will only be able to create a modest set back to its front elevation which would fail to maintain a level of subservience. Moreover the partial pitch roof and flat roof mansard structure will further erode the architectural quality of the area through the introduction of such an incongruous roof form. I consider therefore that the introduction of such contrived architectural elements and lack of set back on this prominent site will result in harm to the overall character and appearance of the property and the local area.
9. Although I consider that there may be ways to extend this property in such a way as to avoid or minimise the harm I have identified above, I consider that the scheme before me would fail to meet the requirements contained within Policies HE9 of the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan (UDP), and the guidance within The Design and Development Control Guidance 2, as well as Policy 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which seek to ensure that new developments are of a high quality standard of design. It would also be contrary to Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the new London Plan (2021) that the above policies are reflective of.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR