



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7th April 2022

by Megan Thomas Q.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities

Decision date: 22nd April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3290021

50 Red House Lane, Bexleyheath DA6 8JD

- 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 Kathleen/Danny Farram against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref.21/02660/FUL, dated 16 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension, a two storey front extension, a single storey rear extension and demolition of the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension, a two storey front extension, a single storey rear extension and demolition of the existing garage at 50 Red House Lane, Bexleyheath DA6 8JD, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref.21/02660/FUL, dated 16 August 2021, 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 strict accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan (HM Land Registry extract), Existing and Proposed Floorplans and Elevations, Typical Section and Proposed Roof Plan, Scales 1:50 & 1:100 (undated).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the main dwelling.

Procedural Matters

2. The single storey rear extension applied for in the application appears to be an existing extension which is in poor repair. I have treated this part of the application/appeal as if it had not been built and was applied for on its merits as part of the appeal.
3. The description of development proposed in the box heading above has been taken from the Council's Notice of Decision dated 14th December 2021 and not from the Planning Application Form. The former description is more accurate

and accords with the submitted plans. In addition, I have added “demolition of the existing garage” to the Council’s description for the avoidance of doubt.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding streetscenes.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached two storey dwelling with attached garage located on the corner of Bean Road and Red House Lane in a predominantly residential area. It sits back in its plot diagonally across the corner, leaving a small triangular rear garden. The house faces south-east. The garage is attached to its western flank adjacent to 2 Bean Road. The road widths at the junction are relatively spacious. The property has a small brick wall around its frontage.
6. The dwelling has a single storey ground floor side extension on its north-eastern flank with a flat roof.
7. The proposed development includes demolishing the existing garage and leaving that land free from built development other than a fence, a single storey front extension about 2m deep, and a two storey front extension with a pitched roof set lower than the main ridge.
8. Dealing first with the rear extension, this would be a simple single storey addition with a monopitch roof and would not extend along the full width of the main rear elevation. It would be a subservient addition and would not cause any detrimental amenity issues for neighbours. Whilst the garden at the rear would be small, this would be compensated for by the land on which the existing garage stands being available for amenity purposes.
9. The proposed front extension would be made up of extending the single storey north-eastern element forwards by about 2m. It would remain single storey and have a front-facing dummy pitched roof to a modest height. The proposed two storey extension would protrude a further circa 1.7m and would include bay windows at ground and first floor levels. It would have a pitched roof set lower than the ridge of the main roof.
10. Whilst front extensions are generally discouraged in local policy, the location and orientation of the appeal site in this particular case allows the proposed development to take place without undue harm to the existing house or character or appearance of the streetscene. The resulting appearance of the dwelling would be balanced with two pairs of stacked bay windows and the roof ridge of the main dwelling remaining dominant. Whilst it would have a more vertical emphasis this would not be detrimental. The proposed new front elements would extend a part of the dwelling which currently steps back from the main frontage and porch and can take advantage of the generous area of land in front of the existing dwelling.
11. The north-eastern single storey element would remain single storey and subservient. Owing to the orientation of the house in a south-easterly direction, the extension would not detrimentally affect the appearance of no.48 Red House Lane. The streetscene of Bean Road would be improved by the removal of the garage as it would create a more spacious appearance making the appeal property look less squeezed into its plot than it currently appears. The resulting

development would be more prominent but it is currently a prominent property and the increased prominence would not be of such a degree to harm the streetscene particularly as the area of land at the front of the dwelling within its curtilage would remain generous. On-site parking would continue to be possible.

12. I conclude that the proposed development would not unduly harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the wider area. It would not conflict with policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy (adopted 2012) or policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2004).

Other Matters

13. No new fenestration at first floor level at the rear of the appeal site is proposed and similarly no new fenestration in any flank walls, and so, there would be no loss of privacy for neighbours as a result of the development. In respect of a potential sense of enclosure for the occupants of 48 Red House Lane at the front, the element closest to them would remain single storey, no.48 faces obliquely away from no.50 in a broadly easterly direction and there is boundary treatment and vegetation on the common boundary. For those reasons, I do not consider there would be a loss of outlook or sense of enclosure for the occupants of no.48 Red House Lane. I note that the Council has not raised any concerns in relation to unacceptable loss of residential amenity such as outlook or privacy for neighbours.

Conditions

14. I have considered the imposition of planning conditions in the light of advice in National Planning Practice Guidance. The Council suggested some conditions in the event that the appeal was successful. A condition which ties the built development to the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings a condition requiring the extension to match the existing materials of the dwelling is necessary.

Conclusion

15. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I allow the appeal and grant planning permission subject to conditions.

Megan Thomas Q.C.

INSPECTOR