



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/21/3286988

1 Blenheim Drive, Welling DA16 3LY

- 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 Francis Yesudas against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref.21/02242/FUL, dated 9 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is to "demolish existing rear conservatory build single storey rear part first floor rear extension and internal alterations."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Appellant has submitted a revised plan (ref. LIVARCH/1BD/AP1) during the appeal process which he seeks to have admitted as an application plan. As this plan has not been subject to consultation, it would be prejudicial to other parties if I accepted the plan as part of the appeal scheme. I therefore do not accept the plan. I determine the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted with the planning application.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 136 Wickham Street in respect of outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a two storey detached property on the western side of Blenheim Drive. It stands back from the footpath behind a block paved forecourt. It faces east. The immediate streetscene of Blenheim Drive and

Wickham Street consists predominantly of two storey, semi-detached properties the design of which varies and many have been altered through extensions.

5. To the north of the appeal site is no.3 Blenheim Drive. This also faces east and is situated close to the appeal building. To the south of the appeal site on the corner of the Drive and Wickham Street is no.132 Wickham Street and to the west of that nos 134 and 136 Wickham Street. Those three houses face south. The rear garden of no.136 is narrow and extends back so that its rearmost section is immediately west of the rear of the appeal site. No.136 has a number of outbuildings/sheds in its garden.
6. The appeal dwelling fills a large percentage of its plot. It has a single storey garage attached to its southern flank wall, which itself was part of a two storey side extension. At its rear it has a two storey flat-roofed extension and a conservatory.
7. The proposed development would involve permission for demolition of the conservatory and the two storey rear flat-roofed extension to be extended southwards over the footprint of the conservatory two storeys high, with the ground floor section being slightly longer than the first floor section with a south-facing lean-to element. A hipped roof would top the development and connect into the existing main roof. At first floor level facing the garden of no.136 Wickham Street there would be one new window in the west elevation which would serve a bathroom and would have obscured glass.
8. The resulting scale and massing of the built development would be considerable especially in comparison to the modest depth of the plot (i.e. east to west). The cumulative impact of the extensions (notwithstanding the demolition of the conservatory) would result in a form of development whereby the extensions would no longer be subservient to the host property and would dominate the host property. The original form of the property would not be discernible and the circa 7m width of wall at first floor level at the rear would itself be domineering and unsympathetic. In terms of the impact on the wider area, I noted on my site visit that the proposed development would be visible from private land and from some public vantage points and the overall impression would be an overdeveloped plot with too much built development squeezed onto it. This would be detrimental to the character of this suburban area.
9. Consequently, on this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would conflict with saved policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2004).

Living Conditions of Occupants of 136 Wickham Street

10. The rear land of no.136 Wickham Street extends northwards and is, in part, directly abutted by the appeal site. Owing to the layout of no.136's garden which includes a single storey outbuilding (possibly a garage), it appears that the part of the garden most useable for amenity purposes is that part which is directly abutted by the appeal site. This is not a large area of useable garden. The proposal incorporates and extends built development, amongst other things, at first floor level so that there would be a wall at first floor level about 7m in width. The proposal also includes a hipped roof which adds to the height

and increases the bulk and mass of the existing two storey extension. In addition to the proposal's height, width, bulk and mass, the separation distance from the common boundary would be in the region of only 2.1m. I consider that the wall would be overbearing, and the occupants of 136 Wickham Street would experience an unacceptable sense of enclosure from the proposal when using their garden. The resulting loss of outlook for the occupants of no.136 would warrant the refusal of planning permission in this particular case.

11. Therefore, on this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause an unacceptable loss of outlook for the occupants of no.136 Wickham Street when using their garden. The proposal would conflict with saved policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2004).

Conclusion

12. Having taken into account all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas Q.C.

INSPECTOR