



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2023

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3311498

10 Glendale Road, Erith, Bexley DA81BP

- 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 Fofanah against the decision of The London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01644/FUL, dated 24 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2022.
 - The proposed development is a part one/ part two storey rear extension with roof alterations incorporating rear dormer to provide rooms in roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of development varies between documents submitted for the purpose of this appeal, I have used the one from the Council's decision notice as this most accurately and concisely describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the host dwelling; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a brick built two storey mid terrace house. This is located on a street of similar palisaded terraced houses on a no-through road. The appeal dwelling has been the subject of recent mostly implemented extensions. These are substantially the same as those detailed in the planning application that is the subject of this appeal, with the exception of the extent and design of the proposed rear dormer extension.
5. The proposal has a smaller flat roofed dormer extension than that already implemented. This would be to the full extent of the rear roof slope of the main dwelling and the pre-existing outrigger. However, unlike the

implemented dormer extension, the proposed dormer would not sit above the two storey rear extension. It is proposed that the two storey rear extension would terminate in a flat roof. The proposed dormer extension would, however, align with the rear elevation of the main house and pre-existing outrigger and the side elevations of the outrigger.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to other rear and dormer extensions in the local area. However, the planning background and age of these has not been provided. From my site visit, these appear to vary considerably in age, scale, and design. The appellant has also drawn my attention and made reference to the development of a recently approved place of worship near to the junction of Glendale Road with Battle Road. This varies considerably in use, scale and design to the proposal. These nearby developments would have been considered on their own individual merits, and I have done likewise in my consideration of the proposal and have only afforded these little weight in my considerations.
7. The already implemented two storey rear extension and mostly implemented full width single storey rear extension square off the rear of the appeal dwelling. When combined with the extent and box like appearance of the proposed rear dormer, the size and scale of the proposal would appear to dominate and unbalance the appearance of the host dwelling. This would have the effect of the development as proposed appearing as an unduly prominent and dominant addition to the appeal dwelling, which would not appear as a subservient addition. The development as proposed would, as a whole, appear as an incongruous addition to the appeal dwelling.

Living Conditions

8. 11 Glendale Road (No.11) adjoins to the appeal dwelling and has been the subject of a recent single storey extension that is the same depth as and sits to the side of the existing outrigger to this neighbouring property. The extension to No.11 extends to the same rear extent as, and aligns with, the two storey extension already implemented at No.10. The partly implemented single storey extension extends further rearward than the existing extension to No.11.
9. The extent and height of the already implemented two storey extension at No.10 results in an enclosing effect and some overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight to the first floor window nearest to the appeal dwelling. This additional degree of enclosure and overshadowing results in an overbearing tunnelling effect and loss of outlook, which would be experienced by the residential occupiers of No.11 as oppressive.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant has set out that the development that is the subject of this appeal is intended to provide improved living space for occupiers. However, this is a private rather than a public benefit and I can, therefore, only give this little weight in my considerations.
11. For the reasons given above, the development as proposed would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. This would fail to accord with the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines 2, as appended to the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) (the UDP), policies

ENV39, H9 of the UDP, policy CS05 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that developments, including extensions, are of a high standard of design and maintain a high standard of amenity for neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR