



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by N Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/23/3321576

336 Old Farm Avenue, Sidcup, Bexley DA15 8AS

- 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 Wells against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 23/00101/FUL, dated 16 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey rear extension to existing property and 2 storey side extension to form 1x4 bedroom new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Bexley Local Plan 2023 has been adopted since the appeal was submitted. This supersedes the Core Strategy 2012 and Unitary Development Plan 2004 and the policies contained within those plans. The Council have confirmed that Policies SP1, DP2, SP5 and DP11 of the new Bexley Local Plan apply to this appeal and that the proposal would conflict specifically with Policies SP5 and DP11. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the changes brought about by the new Local Plan as part of the appeal process. The policies of the London Plan referred to in the Council's decision notice remain in force.
3. Revised versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The street scene is characterised by two-storey terrace and semi-detached residential properties, some of which have been extended. There is a uniformity to their rhythm, widths and appearance with hipped roofs.
6. The proposed dwelling would extend one end of this existing terrace. A dwelling of greater width to that of the properties within the terrace and that of

the host property would be out of keeping with this existing prevailing pattern of development and would unbalanced the appearance of the terrace. Further to this, the different fenestration arrangement would contribute to the out of keeping appearance of the proposed dwelling.

7. The proposal would create a stepped two storey rear element on the new dwelling. This element would appear as a bolt-on and would not integrate well with the overall design of the dwelling, particularly in regard of its roof form. As a result of the proposed form and design, this would create a visually poor addition to the dwelling that would be clearly visible in public views from the surrounding area.
8. The dwelling would be sited in close proximity to the side boundary. The dwelling on the opposite corner has been extended extremely close to the side boundary of its site. Whilst this is a different context as it is an extension to a dwelling and not an additional dwelling, I do not consider the proposal would be particularly out of keeping with the pattern of development in the area in regard of its proximity to the side boundary.
9. There is an extant planning permission Ref: 22/02336/FUL in place for a similar dwelling at the site. That scheme would be of lesser width. That proposal is, therefore, not identical to the proposal that is before me. The appeal proposal, although representing a modest revision to the approved scheme, would nonetheless result in a wider dwelling to the frontage. I have considered this proposal on its own individual merits and found the dwelling would appear unbalanced in the terrace. It would also be out of keeping with pattern of development in area. The proposal would be harmful to the street scene and locality for these reasons.
10. The site is not located within a conservation area or other specific policy designation area. I acknowledge the principle of the development is acceptable to the local planning authority and the proposal would make best use of the land within the site. The proposal would accord with the requirements of the national prescribed space standards and would be acceptable with regard to highway, car parking and nearby residential amenities. Whilst these are merits of the proposed development, they do not overcome my above concerns or justify the proposed development.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to be of a high standard of design that contributes positively to the local environment and ensure that the layout, height, scale and massing, façade treatment, and materials are complementary to the surrounding area and contribute positively to the street scene.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR