



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2021

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3273681

14, Shelley Drive, Welling, DA16 3NY

- 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 R Bishop against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 21/00593/FUL dated 25 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the determination of the application, and the submission of this appeal, a revised National Planning Policy Framework 2021 was adopted on 20 July 2021. The paragraphs of the now replaced 2019 Framework, referred to within the Council's report, have been re-numbered. Paragraph 124 is now paragraph 126 and paragraph 127 is now paragraph 130 within the new Framework. Their objectives are, however, still the same with minor changes to some wording in the relevant paragraphs. Given the main issues for the refusal reason is not considered that this change impacts upon the determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the area and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the end of a row of six terraced properties within a residential area characterised by terraced and semi-detached houses. The row of terraced dwellings, within which the appeal site is located, are relatively uniform in appearance with the Council's report noting minor alterations to neighbouring properties in the form of rear extensions.
5. The Council's refusal reason is specific to the two-storey side extension only. The Council's delegated report specifically states that the proposed single storey rear extension is acceptable in relation to depth, width, height and overall scale. I have no evidence before me to conclude differently following my site visit. In that regard, this appeal will focus on the main issues with specific regard to the two-storey side extension.

6. The two-storey side extension, even without the proposed rear extension, would essentially double the size of the host dwelling. There is no set down from the ridge or set back from the front elevation. The Unitary Development Plan Design and Development Control Guideline 2 is a material consideration. It is clear that two storey side extensions should be designed to be subordinate to the main dwelling. Whilst such guidance is just that, guidance, this is a commonly expected principle with regard to extensions.
7. The proposal would match that of the host dwelling and, from the street scene, it would present, due to bulk, scale and massing as good as an additional terraced dwelling on the end of the row. As a result of this I find the proposal would be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling due to it being a disproportionate addition. I note that the roof pitches are the same, however, I do not find the proposal to be subordinate to the host dwelling in any way.
8. Taking into account the impact to the host dwelling itself I find the proposal's impact is exacerbated by its location within the street scene in that it is on a prominent corner plot. The appeal site is currently occupied by a single storey garage which allows the corner to feel open, with trees adjacent and promotes views through the site. When approaching the site from the junction with Wordsworth Road, Shelley Road rises gently and the appeal site is located at the top of this rise on the left.
9. Such locations are generally more sensitive to development because they are relatively exposed, visually, within the wider area. Two storey development as proposed would negatively impact upon the street scene from that side of Shelley Drive by bringing two storey development forward of the existing building line. Overall, proposing development, at two storeys, to a metre from the site boundary I find would result in the proposal appearing visually dominant within the street scene which would be harmful to the character of the area.
10. The proposal would be contrary to Bexley Core Strategy 2012 (CS) Policy CS01 which seeks to ensure that building height, mass and setting enhances the character of the surrounding locality and CS Policy CS07 which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character. The proposal would also be contrary to saved Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan 2004 (UDP) Policy H9 which requires the siting, design and external appearance of extensions to be compatible with the character of the area and UDP Policy ENV39 which seeks to protect the quality of the built environment by ensuring proposals do not adversely affect the street scene by reason of scale, massing or height.
11. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, paragraph 130, which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has provided examples of other two-storey side extensions within their submissions but I have no details before me as to the consents which granted the developments highlighted. Notwithstanding this, even if I had accepted the proposal as acceptable in terms of impact upon the host dwelling itself I still find the impact upon the character of the area would remain. The appeal site's location, by comparison to those sites which have been

highlighted, is much more visually prominent and each case must be assessed upon its own merits.

13. I note that there are objections from 12 Shelley Drive which raise issues surrounding light, overbearingness and demand/value of their property. Impact upon value and/or property demand is not a planning consideration. Noise during construction could have been dealt with via a Construction Management Plan condition had the proposal been acceptable in other regards. Sound proofing and general build matters would be controlled by Building Regulations. The Council do not raise objection on the ground of neighbouring amenity in their assessment and based upon the evidence before me, I have no reason to conclude differently on this occasion.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR