

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2017

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/17/3169564

47 Willersley Avenue, Sidcup, Kent, DA15 9EJ

- 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 & Mrs Earl against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 16/02996/FUL, dated 21 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear dormer at 47 Willersley Avenue, Sidcup, Kent, DA15 9EJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/02996/FUL, dated 21 November 2016, subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule.

Main issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Willersley Avenue/Braundton Avenue Conservation Area (CA) within which the appeal property is located.

Reasons

3. The CA Appraisal & Management Plan says that *'the designated area has been defined to include the best parts of a typical 1930s chalet style suburban estate.'* Much of the Appraisal is directed to promoting the virtues of preserving the character and appearance of the chalet style pairs of semi-detached dwellings predominating in the area.
 4. Virtually the whole of the assessment contained in the officer report on the application is promulgated on the basis that the appeal property comprises a chalet style property. However, as the appellant has rightly pointed out, the property is not a chalet property of the type described in the CA appraisal. Several photographs of the chalet style dwellings are included in the Appraisal, and it is plain to me that the appeal property does not closely resemble those shown in the photographs.
 5. Rather, the appeal property is one of a pair of properties showing distinct suburban characteristics, but without the prominent front gable, central ridge running at right angles to the road, and steeply sloping side roofs seen typically on those chalet style dwellings remaining unmodified.
-

6. Nonetheless, the appeal property is one of an attractive pair displaying more detailing than usual in typical suburban development, with a double tile-hanged, curved bay, a hipped roof and small, attractively designed side dormers.
7. The property presents an attractive face to the front, but the proposed flat-roofed dormer would be located at the rear. It would be modestly sized, set below the ridge, occupying a reasonable proportion of the roof slope. It would be largely tile-hung. Given its modest size, its visual impact would be contained, and it would be barely noticeable in the public realm. The effect on the host property, in my view, would not be harmful.
8. I conclude that the proposed dormer would sit acceptably in its visual and spatial context without causing harm. At worst, it would have a neutral effect on the visual amenities of the CA, whose character and appearance would therefore be preserved. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of policies ENV39 & ENV46 of the Bexley Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and policies CS06 & CS19 of the Council's Core Strategy designed, in combination, to protect the area's conservation areas from inappropriate development of poor design.

Conditions

9. The Council's suggested condition in respect of materials shall be imposed, with a slight modification, in the interests of visual amenity.
10. It is also necessary in the interests of certainty that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Other matters

11. All other matters raised in the representations have been considered and taken into account, including the views of the Bexley Civic Society who objected to the proposed rooflights. The Council raised no such objection to these features and I see no reason to object either, given their modest size. No other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted, including the tile hanging, shall match those used in the existing building.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings: the location plan and Drawing Reference Nos. 16/47/1 to 16/47/6 (inclusive).