



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/23/3324742

2 Ightham Road, Erith DA8 1LX

- 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 Gemma Bush against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 23/00055/FUL, dated 10 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2023.
 - The proposed development is a two storey side and single storey front & rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and single storey front & rear extension at 2 Ightham Road, Erith DA8 1LX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 23/00055/FUL, dated 10 January 2023, 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 the following approved plans: 2022/64, 2022/65.

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.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the application by the Council the Bexley Local Plan April 2023 (LP) has been adopted. This has superseded all policies contained in the Council's Unitary Development Plan (2004). I have determined the appeal on the basis of the newly adopted LP.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the two-storey side extension on the living conditions of the occupants of 132 and 134 Bedonwell Road having regard to outlook and overbearing impact.

Reasons

4. The appeal site consists of a two-storey, semi-detached property with off-street parking on the driveway to the front. It is located on the south side of Ightham Road in a residential neighbourhood.

5. The side extension would run perpendicular to the rear elevations and garden areas of 132 and 134 Bedonwell Road. It would be set against the backdrop of the existing appeal dwelling, and would not project beyond its existing front or rear elevations. With this my mind, I consider that any changes in the outlook from the openings at both ground and first floor level of Nos. 132 and 134 would be limited. Views in other directions, for example along Ightham Road and over the rear garden scene of dwellings in Belmont Road and Ightham Road, would remain unimpeded and ensure that the appeal scheme would not dominate the outlook from the habitable areas.
6. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would not have an unduly oppressive or intrusive effect on occupants of the internal rooms of Nos. 132 and 134. Even when viewed through the ground floor openings, the proposal is unlikely to result in a sense of confinement or enclosure sufficient to harm the living conditions of occupants. In a relatively high-density area such as this, it would clearly not be unusual to be able to see the built form of other dwellings from living rooms or bedrooms.
7. I note that the Council does not appear to object to the ground floor front or the rear elements of the proposals, and I have no reason to disagree.
8. On this basis I am drawn to conclude that the scheme would not result in material harm to the living conditions of the occupants of 132 and 134 Bedonwell Road with regard to outlook and overbearing impact. It would meet with Policy DP11 of the LP and the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines 2, which together seek to ensure that ensure that, amongst other things, appropriate levels of outlook and other forms of amenity are provided.

Conditions

9. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match those on the existing dwelling would provide for a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

10. Given my thoughts above and based on all matters advanced, the appeal is allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR