



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/24/3357799

161A Rowley Avenue, Sidcup, Kent DA15 9LQ

- 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 Ms E Kaijage against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/02555/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first floor side and rear extension at 161A Rowley Avenue, Sidcup DA15 9LQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02555/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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers 161A-ROWLEY-AVENUE-SE-01 Rev A and 161A-ROWLEY-AVENUE-SE-02 Rev A.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling that is located on the corner of Rowley Avenue and Harcourt Avenue in a residential area of Sidcup. On my site visit I observed that several nearby dwellings have been altered and extended creating a diverse street scene in terms of layout, scale and design.
5. The appeal property is accessed on Rowley Avenue, however the principal elevation with bay windows is viewed from Harcourt Avenue. The appeal proposal

would be set back from the principal elevation and sit behind the existing side entrance porch. The design and scale would appear subordinate to the existing dwelling causing no harm to the street scene when viewed from this location.

6. The appeal proposal would be more prominent when viewed from Rowley Avenue and would create an additional storey over the existing side extension and part of the existing rear extension. The design is sympathetic to the existing property and would involve a minimal increase in footprint with the proposed side elevation of the dwelling remaining the same distance from the site boundary. A high fence runs from the entrance porch on Rowley Avenue along the remaining side boundary with two established trees on the grass verge in front. Due to their scale and appearance, the fence and trees already have a dominating impact on the street scene which would mitigate any impact caused by the appeal proposal which would sit behind the fence.
7. Concerns have been raised that the appeal proposal would result in a long first floor elevation sitting close to the site boundary. On my site visit I observed other corner plots close to the appeal property which appeared to have been extended in a similar manner. Although the appeal proposal would be larger than these examples in terms of scale and mass, it would not be an incongruous addition to the property and would complement the diversity of the street scene. Furthermore, the appeal proposal would also involve the lowering of the ridge height of the existing roof which would be subservient to the existing property.
8. The appeal proposal would therefore accord with policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan 2023 which requires development to be of high-quality design and for layout, height, scale and massing to be complimentary to the surrounding area and contribute positively to the street scene.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement of the development, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to provide certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR