
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2021

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3270036

23A Camden Road, Bexley, DA5 3NS

- 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 and Mrs Garimella against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/02743/FUL, dated 24 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 23A Camden Road, Bexley, DA5 3NS, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 20/02743/FUL, dated 24 October 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following 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: BL/DRG/15/06/2020/01A, BL/DRG/15/06/2020/02A, BL/DRG/15/06/2020/03 and BL/DRG/15/06/2020/04A.

Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 23A Camden Road is one of two detached houses set well behind properties fronting onto Camden Road. It is located more or less centrally in a large plot which is well screened by fencing and large mature trees. The layout of surrounding properties and the steep change in ground levels between some of those properties and the site are such that the rear of No.23A is not readily visible either from The North Glade where the properties are set at an oblique angle, or from the bungalows in Woodstock Close, which are set well below the ground level at No. 23A. The surrounding area is a well established residential area with a wide variety of house styles and sizes. Although there are some common design themes, there is no one style predominating and the range of materials includes brick, tile hanging, render and slate or tiled roofs.
4. No. 23A is a two storey house which has been recently extended to provide additional accommodation in the roof and refurbished in a modern style with white render and a dark grey slate roof and dormer windows. The proposed single storey rear extension

would extend the full width of the existing house, projecting approximately 6m and replacing an earlier conservatory, now demolished.

5. I consider that, although the proposal would be large in itself, it would not be unduly out of scale with the existing house. It would result in a significant increase in the footprint of the property, but would not unbalance the overall proportions of the house, nor dominate it in comparison with the strong character of the roof. It would be compatible with the character of the existing building and the plot is large enough to accommodate the additional built form without resulting in overdevelopment. The rear garden is secluded and the proposal would not be visible from the public realm. It would have no impact on the street scene and would not be out of keeping with the varied character of the surrounding area.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and that it is consistent with policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy 2012 and saved policies H9 and ENV39 of the London Borough of Bexley UDP 2004 and the advice in the Council's *Design and Development Control Guidelines* 2004, which relate, among other things, to the design of development, including residential extensions, and its impact on the character and appearance of the existing building and the wider surroundings.
7. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. The suggested condition relating to materials to match the existing is at odds with the planning application and the submitted plans hereby approved, which specify the use of brickwork, whereas the existing house is now rendered and painted white. I shall not impose this condition since the plans are sufficiently detailed to specify the materials.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR