



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3294789

192 Erith Road, Bexleyheath DA7 6HU

- 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 Kashmir Atwal against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03561/FUL, dated 26 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 192 Erith Road, Bexleyheath DA7 6HU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03561/FUL, dated 26 November 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 bathroom window in the side elevation 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.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Kashmir Atwal against London Borough of Bexley Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area, with reference to streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house located on a corner plot at the junction of Lyndhurst Road with Erith Road. Along with many of its neighbouring semidetached properties it has undergone significant extension and alteration. This includes a single storey flat roofed side extension that faces onto Lyndhurst Road behind a boundary wall.

5. Although the existing house has undergone extensive extension and alteration, it is a large semi-detached house on a proportionately sized plot. However, the existing single storey side extension has a flat roofed box like appearance that does not integrate wholly successfully with the character and appearance of the rest of the house or the semi-detached pair of which the appeal property forms part.
6. The proposal is for a first floor extension incorporating 2 bedrooms and a bathroom that would extend across the full width of the existing side extension but would be set back from its existing front and rear elevations. The proposal would have a hipped crown roof form and would introduce two small roof slopes above the remaining roof areas of the existing extension. The proposed crown roof would be lower than the roof on the main part of the house. The roof form of the existing house incorporates an earlier extension into the roof, which with other extensions results in the existing house having a combination of hipped and crown roof forms. The proposed hipped and crown roof form would, therefore, reflect the existing roof forms and the character and appearance of the existing house and that of its semi-detached pair.
7. Although the proposal would add a significant extension at first floor level, this would be above the existing single storey side extension and would not further extend the footprint of the appeal property. The proposed front and rear set-backs, roof forms and roof line, which would be lower than that of the main house, would result in it appearing as a subservient addition to the main house and less intrusive than the existing flat roofed side extension. For these reasons, I do not find that proposal would erode the openness of the extensive corner plot.
8. Given that the appeal property is on a corner plot and faces onto Erith Road and has a long rear garden bordering Lyndhurst Road, I do not find that the addition of a first floor extension above an existing ground floor extension would have a direct visual relationship with the rest of the properties on Lyndhurst Road and would not result in any detrimental visual impact on the existing building line of that street.
9. I have had regard to earlier planning and appeal decisions with regard to previous decisions on proposals for side extensions to the appeal property. I acknowledge that the proposal is similar to these earlier proposals but does have material differences in its extent and design. I have, therefore, considered the proposal on its own merits, which is a fundamental principle of the planning system.
10. For the above reasons, I find that in views from both Erith and Lyndhurst Roads, the proposal would result in an improvement to the appearance of the appeal property and street scene at this prominent corner location and would not, therefore, result in any harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property, its semi-detached pair or that of the local area.

Conditions

11. As well as the standard conditions relating to the timing of implementation and drawings, I have applied a condition requiring materials to be used for the proposal to match those of the host dwelling, this is to ensure design

quality. To protect privacy, I have also imposed a condition relating to the bathroom glazing at first floor level.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR