

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2024

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/24/3341214

29 Dartford Road, Bexley, Kent DA5 2AY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mansukh Kanji against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 23/03138/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part one/part two storey front extension and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a part one/part two storey front extension and first floor rear extension at 29 Dartford Road, Bexley, Kent, DA5 2AY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/03138/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing Nos: 23/1, 23/2, 23/3, 23/4 and Site Location Plan.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in my formal decision and banner heading above is taken from the Council's decision notice, which I consider to be a more precise description of the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached two storey property in a residential area, characterised by detached properties facing the highway, with deep rear gardens. The appeal site is located adjacent to the site of Baldwyn's Park Baptist Church. The church building is well set back from the road, with an area of hardstanding between it and the appeal property which serves as

parking and access to the wider church site. The existing flank of the appeal property therefore appears in view when approaching from a south-easterly direction along Dartford Road. The Council's officer report (OR) which considered the application indicates that the proposed front extension would be acceptable. I find no reason to consider otherwise.

5. The appeal property benefits from previous additions, such that it extends about 9m from its original rear elevation at the ground floor, and about 5.35m at first floor level. The proposal would further extend the depth of the first floor of the property by about 3.5m. Due to the proposed sympathetic roof form and a ridge and eaves height to match that existing, together with the use of matching materials, the proposed rear first floor extension would be of a harmonious design to its host.
6. As a result of the proposal, the appeal property would still be situated in a generously sized plot with a deep remaining rear garden space. The relationship with neighbouring built forms is such that the proposed rear extension would not appear overbearing or dominating to its immediate neighbours, nor would it result in any adverse harm to neighbouring privacy. These factors, together with my own observations indicate that the proposal would not result in overdevelopment within the plot.
7. While the flank of the appeal property appears within view along Dartford Road, the additional mass that would arise from the rear first floor extension would not be so significant or so prominent within the street scene as to be unacceptable.
8. Drawing all of the above together, the scale, height, depth, massing and materials of the proposed first floor rear extension would not harm the character and appearance of its host, nor the surrounding area.
9. Although the reason for refusal states that the proposed rear first floor extension would not appear as a subordinate extension, this is not a stated requirement of Policies SP5 and DP 11 of the Bexley Local Plan 2023 (BLP). The Council's OR indicates that the proposal would result in a cumulative increase of 167% to the original dwelling, and this is not disputed by the appellant. However, the Council accepts that large extensions are common along Dartford Road, and there is nothing before me in the policy wording or supporting text of Policies SP5 and DP11 to indicate that any threshold is employed to assess the acceptability of any extensions, nor any guidance as to what threshold might be considered inappropriate.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of its host or the surrounding area. It accords with BLP Policies SP5 and DP11 which seek to ensure high quality design, and that the layout, height, scale and massing and materials of extensions are complimentary to the surrounding area and contribute to the street scene.

Conditions

11. The Council suggested conditions in the event the appeal was successful. I have referenced the planning application and the plans submitted with it in my formal decision above. To meet legislative requirements, a condition is

imposed to address the period for commencement. A matching materials condition is necessary and reasonable in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. A condition is imposed to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed and planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions I have set out.

J Moore

INSPECTOR