



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2021

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3276030

118 Steynton Avenue, Bexley DA5 3HG

- 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 M Brash against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00499/FUL, dated 15 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension and single storey rear extension at 118 Steynton Avenue, Bexley DA5 3HG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00499/FUL, dated 15 February 2021, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
 - 3) The first floor ensuite window in the rear elevation of the extension shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.
 - 4) No construction work shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday and 8.00am and 1pm on Saturdays. There shall be no working on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr M Bash against the London Borough of Bexley Council (the Council). This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house on a generous corner plot on Steynton Avenue, which has been the subject of earlier single storey and rear conservatory extensions. The local area is residential and made up of similar sized semi-detached houses interspersed with the occasional bungalows. Most of these properties appear to have undergone significant alteration and extension in a variety of forms and scale.
5. The proposal would extend the property at first floor over the full extent of the existing side extension. This would be set back slightly from the main front elevation and would extend and replicate the existing roof form. The proposal would also replace the existing flat roofed rear conservatory with a larger single-story extension with a mono pitch roof.
6. The Council has raised no concerns in relation to the proposed ground floor extension and I likewise find that this element of the proposal would be of an acceptable size, form and finish that would sit comfortably in the generously proportioned rear garden.
7. The first floor element of the proposed extensions would appear to be of the same form, size and finish as an extension that was the subject of an approved but unimplemented planning application, approved by the Council in 2005¹. However, in the material submitted for the purposes of this appeal the council has made no mention of this, only referencing the approvals for the single storey ground floor side and rear extensions that have been implemented.
8. The proposed first floor side extension would add considerable additional bulk at first and roof level. This would be above the existing ground floor side extension and would be recessed from the main front elevation along with a set down in the ridge height. The roof to this extension would also be massed to reflect the existing roof of the original house. Despite the scale of the proposal, the design approach taken would result in the proposal appearing as a subservient addition to the existing house, appropriately reflecting its original design and detailing.
9. Although the proposal would result in a larger house than the existing and its semi-detached pair, this would reflect the streetscene of the area, where semi-detached houses have been individually altered and extended in a variety of scales, forms and finishes. The extra width of the appeal plot would allow the proposed first floor and roof extension to sit comfortably on the existing building and would not appear cramped on its plot.
10. Given the corner location on this wide street and the generous plot size the proposed first floor extension would be visible in the round. The proposal would infill the space above the existing ground floor side extension, which given the width of the plot, currently appears as a weak element in the local streetscene. The proposal would provide a corner element currently missing in the street scene, which would be a strong feature, significantly improving the character and appearance of the local area.
11. For these reasons I do not find that the proposal would fail to be subordinate to the main building or that, in combination with the existing side extension, it would result in an incongruous addition that would have the outcome of the

¹ Planning Ref: 05/00180/FUL

appeal property appearing overly dominant and at odds with the local streetscene.

12. The proposal would, therefore, cause no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and would result in an enhancement to that of the local area. This would be in compliance with Policy CS03 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012), saved Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004), Guideline 2 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan Design and Development Control Guidelines, Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which collectively seek developments, including extensions, that are of good design and compatible with the character and appearance of the existing building and local area.

Conditions

13. I have had regard to the proposed conditions suggested by the council in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have included the standard required condition relating to the timing of implementation, and to ensure that the proposal remains consistent with the appearance of the existing house, I have included a condition relating to matching of materials. To protect privacy, I have imposed a condition relating to glazing at the first floor level of the proposed extension and to avoid local disturbance during construction I have also imposed a condition that controls its hours.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR