



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3306725

15 Marlborough Road, Bexleyheath DA7 4UP

- 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 Mrs R Thandi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 22/01121/FUL, dated 28 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension.
-

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 host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey, semi-detached house. It is situated in a residential street comprising semi-detached houses of similar age and appearance, many of which include single-storey extensions and/or conservatories to the rear. Neither the appeal property nor its attached pair, 13 Marlborough Road, have been extended at the rear.
4. The proposal would comprise a single-storey rear extension with a flat roof. This would occupy almost the whole width of the site and the main part would extend a significant distance beyond the original rear wall of the house, almost doubling the front-to-back depth of the property. It would be far larger, and notably more intrusive than, nearby rear additions, and would be incompatible with the scale of the appeal property and its attached pair.
5. I conclude that due to its size, siting and design the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to accord with Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012), which seek to ensure new developments are of a high standard of design and compatible with the character of existing and adjacent buildings having regard to matters such as scale, massing, height and intensity of development. The proposal is also contrary to the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) and the Council's Design and Development

Control Guideline No 2, the latter of which advises that extensions should protect the character of the property and the area.

6. I recognise that the property may benefit from permitted development rights that would potentially allow the appellant to add a sizeable rear extension. However, there is no evidence before me to demonstrate that permitted development rights would enable an extension that is comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of its rear projection and arrangement. Therefore I attribute limited weight to this matter.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR