



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/23/3334250

37 Sunningdale Close, Bexley, London SE28 8QR

- 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 R Yacht against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 23/02163/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of one x 2 bedroom, three storey end of terrace dwelling with provision for car parking, cycle storage and refuse and recycling provision.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.
3. The appeal site has been subject to a previous refused planning permission and dismissed appeal for the 'erection of a three storey end of terrace dwelling with parking provision, cycle storage and refuse and recycling provision' (Planning Ref: 22/01220/FUL& Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/22/3309980). This proposal differs to that of the previously proposed scheme in that an increased buffer has been provided between the development and the public realm. For the purposes of clarity, I have considered the proposal, the subject of this appeal, on its own merits.

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 proposal would extend the existing terrace and be positioned approximately 1.3m from the eastern boundary with highway beyond. The site is located at the entrance to the cul-de-sac of Sunningdale Close. The existing garden to the side of the terrace provides an openness to the street scene, as does that of the building opposite. This openness contributes significantly to the character of the development in this locality and is therefore an important feature of the street scene.

6. The proposal would extend the terrace closer to the public highway. A development of the size and scale proposed would create an enclosing feature at the entrance of the cul-de-sac. In views on approaching the cul-de-sac as well as in views along Sunningdale Close this three storey development would appear as an overly dominant feature within the street scene. The buffer between the dwelling and the public realm would not be sufficient to mitigate the visually overbearing impacts of the development and the harm arising from the loss of openness at this part of the street scene.
7. The existing terrace has a symmetrical character with uniformity to the widths of the properties within it. Although being of matching materials (that could be controlled by an appropriately worded planning condition), roof design and continuing the building line of the terrace, the proposed dwelling would have a narrower width to those existing properties within the terrace and would not incorporate a garage at ground level. As such, the proposal would erode of the existing symmetry of the terrace and would appear poorly proportioned when looking at the terrace as a whole. Consequently, the development would not assimilate successfully with the existing terrace and for this reason the proposal would represent a visually harmful extension to the terrace.
8. I have been referred to other examples in the locality where it is suggested those examples are similar to that proposed here. However, the massing of some of those developments and/or their proximity to the public realm do not represent direct parallels to that proposed here. Furthermore, they do not host the same locational characteristics as this appeal site being located at the entrance to a cul-de-sac. Some of the photographs submitted in support of the appeal illustrate 3 and 4 storey development in the wider area that abuts the public realm. I accept the buffer in this case would allow for a greater separation to that of those examples provided. Nonetheless, those examples reinforce my concerns with regard to maintaining the openness that contributes to the character of the development in this locality, which I have found to be an important feature of this street scene.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the size, location and design of 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 2023 and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 and the provisions of the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to achieve high-quality design through delivering good design.

Conclusion

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

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR