

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2021

by David Fitzsimon MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3271947

27 Newlyn Road, Welling DA16 3LH

- 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 Ms V Nguyen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 21/00137/FUL, dated 15 January 2021 was refused by notice dated 12 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my visit, a part two storey and part single storey rear extension with an open lean-to structure, along with a single storey side extension had been built at the appeal property. The single storey element of the extension appeared to be of the same dimensions as the proposal before me. For the avoidance of doubt, the appeal proposal relates solely to a single storey flat roofed extension. It does not include the other elements that were present and therefore I shall refer to it 'as proposed'.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 29 Newlyn Road with particular regards to outlook and access to natural light.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal relates to a semi-detached property. The proposal seeks planning permission for a single storey extension spanning the full width of the existing dwelling, with a rearward projection of some 6 metres. I understand that a previous single storey extension projected some 4 metres, but this was not present at the time of my visit.
-

5. Like the single storey section of the 'as built' extension, the proposed extension would be only 2 metres deeper than the previous extension. However the total depth would significantly exceed the maximum 3.5 metres recommended by the Council's adopted Development Control Guidelines Note 2 (Extensions to Houses) (DCGN2). The proposed extension would also be deeper than any of the other extensions within the immediate vicinity that I could see. Whilst it would not be seen from the street, when viewed in the context of this pair of semi-detached dwellings, with the attached dwelling having not been extended to the rear, the proposed extension would appear as a disproportionate and over-sized addition. In such terms, it would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Living conditions

6. Like the single storey section of the built extension, the proposed extension would run along the boundary with the attached dwelling, No. 29 Newlyn Road which as I have explained, has not been extended to the rear. As noted, the level of rearward projection significantly exceeds the DCGN2 guideline. Even though the eaves height would be below the maximum 3.1 metres of the DCGN2, this underlines my concern that the large expanse of the side elevation of the proposed extension would appear overly dominant and oppressive when viewed from the nearest rooms at the back of No. 29 and from its patio area.
7. Given the northerly aspect of the rear of these properties, the proposed extension would also cast significant shadow over the nearest room at the back of No. 29 along with its patio area at certain times of the day, thereby unacceptably reducing the levels of natural light available to its occupiers. As a result, the proposed extension would have an unduly harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 29 Newlyn Road.

Other considerations

8. The Appellant points to the fact that a 6 metre deep single storey extension could be built under the 'Prior Approval: Larger Home Extension' scheme and refers to an associated Appeal Decision (Ref. APP/D5120/D/17/3172096). However, I note in that particular case the attached dwelling had also been extended to the rear. In any event, the proposal before me is a formal application for planning permission where matters of design in addition to residential amenity must be taken into account. The appellant also explains that the proposed extension would provide additional living space, but this aim is common to most domestic extensions.

Overall Conclusions

9. The proposed single storey rear extension would be an over-sized addition and would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would also harm the outlook for the occupiers of No. 29 Newlyn Road along with the levels of natural light available to this property at certain times of the day. In such terms, the proposal conflicts with policy CS01 of the adopted Bexley Core Strategy, policies H9 and ENV39 of the adopted Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan and DCGN2; which collectively promote high quality design that is appropriate to its context and seek to safeguard appropriate levels of residential amenity. The arguments advanced by the appellant do not

outweigh these failings and policy conflict therefore the appeal does not succeed.

David Fitzsimon

INSPECTOR