
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/17/3166626

25 Shuttle Close, Sidcup DA15 8EP

- 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 Bhrijesh Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 16/01345/FUL was refused by notice dated 14 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is part one/part two storey side/rear/front extension incorporating formation of rear dormer (including a hip to gable) extension to provide rooms in roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling with hipped side roofs on the main roof and existing side extensions and on the adjoining property. The appeal property lies within an area characterised by predominately semi-detached dwellings. There are a large number of hipped roofs, although there are some gable sides and flat roofs on side projections of dwellings in the area.
 4. Guidance in the Bexley Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Design and Development Control Guidelines 2 (2004) states that roof extensions should follow the pattern of the main roof and have the same angle of pitch.
 5. I was not able to enter the appeal property but was able to view the rear of the premises from the neighbouring rear garden at 23 Shuttle Close. I note that planning permission, Ref 12/00553/FUL, for part one/part two storey side/rear/front extension has been granted and substantially constructed. The Council has stated that the remaining areas of consideration include the proposed hipped to gable and rear dormer.
 6. From my observations, due to the design, position and scale, the proposed hip to gable would unbalance the hipped design of the roof of this pair of semi-detached dwellings, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the
-

dwelling in the streetscene. In addition, due to the scale and design of this element, I consider that it would unacceptably overwhelm the roof of the existing property, to the detriment of its character and appearance.

7. The proposed flat roof rear dormer would extend across the majority of the rear roof elevation. From my observations, it would appear as an unacceptably bulky addition to the roof, which would be visible from neighbouring properties. Due to the siting, bulk and design of the proposed dormer, I consider that it would be an unsympathetic addition which would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and pair of semi-detached dwellings.
8. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Thus the proposal would be contrary to Policies H9 and ENV39 in the London Borough of Bexley UDP (2004) and UDP guidelines and Policy CS06 in the Bexley Core Strategy (2012), where they seek to ensure that extensions are compatible with the character of the existing building and are in keeping with the character of the area.
9. I consider the policies and guidelines referred to above are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR