



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2021

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3271606

21 Frensham Road, New Eltham SE9 3RG

- 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 Thomas Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 21/00235/FUL, dated 24 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single / part two storey rear extension together with part first floor / part two storey side extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The updated National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on the 20 July 2021. I have referred to this where relevant.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

4. The dwelling on the appeal site is a semi-detached property of distinctive style and appearance with long 'catslide' roof to the side elevation and ground floor square bay projection under a tiled roof with semi-circular bay above under a further small, tiled roof beneath an overhanging front gable to the front elevation. It is finished mainly in render but with attractive brick feature banding beneath the front bay windows.
5. The dwellings within the street are of similar original design generally providing attractive semi-detached pairs of dwellings of regular appearance with uniform gaps between them provided by driveways to the side to access garages set behind the dwellings. However, many have been extended to the side, including a number with rather bulky, unsympathetic first floor additions of either hipped or flat roofs set into the catslide roof, resulting in the loss of this attractive feature in a number of properties.
6. The proposed extensions to the dwelling on the appeal site would take a different approach, with a relatively modest first floor, hipped roof addition set back from the front elevation towards the rear half of the catslide roof. A second two storey element would then extend to the rear of this, tying into the

- rear corner of the extended dwelling, with a hipped roof form. It would be set around 800mm from the side boundary maintaining a walkway to the rear garden. A further single storey element would extend from the rear elevation.
7. I consider that the first floor addition to the rear of the roofslope would be a sympathetic addition, with subservient ridge height and scale which would complement the style of the original dwelling, maintaining much of its distinctive appearance including a large part of the original catslide roof. The rear single storey element would also be of complementary scale and design.
 8. However, the proposed two storey element, whilst set some distance behind the front elevation, would nevertheless appear as a discordant addition, with a hipped roof with central ridge at right angles to that of the first floor addition resulting in a somewhat awkward visual relationship between the two. It would also have the effect of significantly reducing the gap that currently exists between the dwelling on the appeal site and its neighbour at No. 23 thus adversely affecting the overall uniform spacing apparent between properties which contributes to the character of the street. At the time of my site visit there did not appear to be any similar side extensions that had the effect of reducing the feeling of spaciousness that enhances the street scene character.
 9. I appreciate that the two storey element would be set some distance back from the road frontage such that it would only likely be seen when relatively close the dwelling. Nevertheless, its appearance would be sufficiently at odds with that of the host dwelling and the wider streetscene to result in an unsympathetic addition.
 10. Overall, I consider that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. It would conflict with Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012) and policies H9 and ENV39 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) (UDP) which seek sustainable development that maintains and improves suburban character by ensuring new development reflects or where possible enhances the unique characteristics of these areas and enhances local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness, pay attention to detail and are compatible in terms of scale and design. For these reasons the proposal would also fail to accord with the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines (2004) which provide detailed design guidance to support the above policies particularly in respect to side extensions which should reflect the form and design of the host dwelling.
 11. The proposal would also fail to comply with the Framework, in particular paragraph 130, which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and the built environment generally.
 12. I acknowledge that the extended property would provide enhanced accommodation for its occupants, but this benefit does not outweigh the harm identified.
 13. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR