



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3274114

3 St Mary's Road, Bexley, Kent DA5 2DD

- 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 N Dwan against the decision of London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/03324/FUL, dated 17 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side/front extension, ground floor rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling with a catslide type roof that projects partially forward on one side on the frontage, with a dormer window within it. The remainder of the front first floor is within the vertical face of the dwelling and is positioned behind a projecting ground floor. Between the ground floor and first floor, there is an upward sloping pitched roof. To the side of the dwelling, there is an attached double garage and detached single garage.
4. As a result of this design articulation, the size, massing and bulk of the dwelling is minimised. The dwelling is within a staggered row of dwellings built at the same time which generally have similarities in terms of the catslide roof, dormer and a first floor stepped back from a ground floor below. Such articulation results in these dwellings having a distinctive appearance and character of graduated and modest scale within the street. In contrast, the dwellings on the opposite side of the road have a varied and generally individualistic range of house designs, which are more prominent, especially those with projecting bay gables.
5. Amongst various principles, the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines (DDCG) states in general extensions should be subordinate to

existing building and that siting, design and external appearance should respect the character of existing building at paragraph 2.2.1.

6. With the front extension, the appeal dwelling would have a prominent and dominant two storey in the form of a gabled bay which would partly infill a gap that exists with 1 St Mary's Road. This would contrast markedly with neighbouring dwellings on this side of the street which have a more articulated built form to the front. Consequently, the extended dwelling would not be of a high standard of design and would stand out as discordant and intrusive feature within the street.
7. The street frontage opposite shows the attractiveness of varied house designs and forms within spacious plots. However, the lower profile appearance and character of dwellings along this side of the street remains a distinctive and attractive quality which the extended dwelling would be unsympathetic to.
8. For all these reasons, the front extension would not be compatible with the character of the surrounding area and would not protect the quality of the built environment. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy (CS) 2012 and Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2004. For the reasons indicated, the proposal would be contrary to the advice of the DDCG.

Other matters

9. Parties were consulted over the effect of the two storey flank of the extended dwelling on the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 St Mary's Road, having regard to outlook. Following this, no significant adverse effect was found given the location of the nearest windows and size of the plot. There have been no third party objections to the proposal based on living conditions but if there were objections with any future planning proposal, these would have to be considered on their planning merits.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in a significant way. There would be conflict with policies of the CS and UDP, and the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations to outweigh that finding. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR