
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: 27th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/23/3332183
110 Olron Crescent, Bexleyheath DA6 8JZ

- 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 S & C Medall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 23/01485/FUL, dated 19 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2023.
 - The proposed development is for a single storey rear extension and 1st storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development having regard to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey house in the northeastern corner of Olron Crescent, at the intersection with Grosvenor Road. The streetscene is residential in nature, and consists of dwellings of broadly similar scale and design. There is a public footpath running along the side of the site that leads to Bexleyheath Golf Club at the rear.
 4. The first floor element would be visible within the local area along the public footpath and from the golf course car park, projecting to the side and rear of the main house. Although it would maintain the eaves line and be lower than the ridge, the overall scale and extent would dominate the rear elevation. The width of the addition would exceed that of the existing property, creating a strong horizontal emphasis at first floor level that would be markedly at odds with the proportions of the host dwelling.
 5. The adverse impact would be exacerbated by the large and unattractive expanse of crowned roof. This would introduce an awkward, disjointed form of development with various angular elements, the extent of which would lack architectural subtlety.
 6. I acknowledge that the property is not a listed building, there are no listed buildings close by and the site is not within a conservation area. Moreover, a suitably-sized rear amenity space is to be retained, no negative neighbour impacts will arise, and the proposal would be built in matching materials.
-

However, none of these points would counterbalance the harm I have identified above.

7. I recognise that there is no reference within Policy DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan April 2023 (LP) to any test of proportionality, or to the Council having a specific policy requirement for extensions to be 'subservient' to the host building. I am also satisfied that the extent of the site would suggest that cumulative extensions to the house could be achieved without necessarily resulting in an over-development of the land. Nonetheless, the proposals before me remain unacceptable for the specific reasons outlined previously.
8. I saw at my site visit the extension to 55 Grosvenor Road as highlighted by the appellant. This is significantly different to the appeal scheme in terms of its size and design, and therefore does not weigh in favour of the proposal. In any event, development at other houses would be neutral considerations in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
9. On this basis I am drawn to conclude that the scheme would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would contravene Policy DP11 of the LP, which seeks to ensure development is of an acceptable scale and design.

Conclusion

10. Given all matters advanced, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR