



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3300356

62 Howard Avenue, Bexley DA5 3BE

- 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 J Holohan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 21/03432/FUL, dated 11 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing conservatory and the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing conservatory and the erection of a single storey rear extension at 62 Howard Avenue, Bexley DA5 3BE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/03432/FUL, dated 11 November 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 accordance with drawing numbers: 62HA_00 B ; 62HA_01 A and 62HA_02 B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The dwellings along Howard Avenue are arranged in two storey terraces, whose main roofs are typically gabled or hipped. Viewed from the road, notwithstanding alterations and varied facing materials, their form and style is fairly cohesive. However, to the rear, many have been significantly altered. Those alterations include large dormer windows, and single or two storey extensions of varied proportions, form and facing materials.

4. The host already has a flat roofed two storey rear projection and a single storey rear extension whose steeply pitched roof abuts the flank of the adjoining house. Beyond those it also has a hipped roofed conservatory. As a result, it has a rather eclectic form.
5. The proposed removal of the steeply pitched section of roof, along with the replacement of the existing conservatory with one with a monopitch and flat roof would, in my view, simplify the host's rear face and give it a more cohesive appearance. Additionally, the conservatory's pitched roof would broadly reflect the form of the adjacent single storey extension at No 64.
6. Turning to its scale, whilst the conservatory would be deeper than the one it would replace, it would have a similar width, and other than its lantern, it would not be markedly taller. Although it would have a greater bulk than the existing conservatory, having regard to cumulative impacts, the scheme as a whole would not jar with the host property; and the dwelling's setting would still include a long rear garden. Whilst nearby rear extensions on this side of Howard Avenue are typically less deep than that proposed here, in the context of the locally diverse townscape, the scheme would not appear out of place.
7. Amongst other things, and in general terms, Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004, and Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy 2012, seek to maintain and improve suburban character with development which is compatible with the surrounding area having regard to matters such as scale, massing, height and intensity of development. For the above reasons, the scheme would not conflict with those policies, or with the requirement for good design which is sympathetic to local character in the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. The Council has not directed me to any particular part of its Design and Development Control Guideline No 2, but I am satisfied that the scheme would not conflict with its general advice that extensions should protect the character of the property and the area.

Other matters

9. Parts of 64 Howard Avenue are on the boundary line. However, I have no substantive evidence that the appeal proposal would be likely to result in damage to that property, and works to ensure that a party wall is appropriately addressed would normally be covered by separate legal rights.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is also necessary. For the above reasons, I conclude that the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host or the area. Having regard to all other matters raised, including representations by interested parties, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR