



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 26th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/17/3173575

141 Parkside Avenue, Bexleyheath, Kent, DA7 6NP

- 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 Bal Sain against the decision of London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 16/01724/FUL, dated 6 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the retention of a 1 x 3 bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space converted from previously approved two storey side extension and revision to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the retention of a 1 x 3 bed dwelling with associated parking and amenity space converted from previously approved two storey side extension and revision to roof at 141 Parkside Avenue, Bexleyheath, Kent, DA7 6NP in accordance with the terms of the application, 16/01724/FUL, dated 6 May, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development from the submitted appeal form, which reflects the description given on the Council's decision notice. This is more precise than the description given in the application form.
3. The dwelling has been erected, although it has yet to be fully completed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling located in a corner position at the junction of Parkside Avenue and Parkside Cross. Permission was granted in 2011 for a side extension to No 141, and while I have not been provided with any detailed plans of this scheme, it is understood that this comprised of a side extension with a hipped roof and rear extension with a flat roof as well as other minor works. The works undertaken to this property do not accord with the approved plans for the extensions.
6. It is proposed to retain the side and rear extension and convert this to a separate dwelling. As built, and as shown on the submitted plans, this includes

- a gabled roof structure and accommodation at third floor level within a dormer window located to the rear elevation.
7. The roof of the proposed dwelling changes the form of the original hipped roof of No 141 into a gabled roof structure. Properties along Parkside Avenue have a variety of roof structures, including hipped roof, flat roofs and gabled roofs, including a gabled roof at No 139a which located to the west of the appeal site, on the opposite corner of Parkside Close. While the creation of a gabled roof at the appeal property has undoubtedly changed the appearance of No 141, I find that this would be in harmony with the varied character of the roofscape within the street scene and causes no harm.
 8. Moreover, the development extends at the same height as the existing ridgeline of No 141 and is consistent with ridgeline along the rest of the terrace to the east. The development is therefore in keeping with No 141 and as an extension to the terrace to create a further dwelling and does not appear as an incongruous addition which is out of scale with these dwellings.
 9. The proposed dwelling is served by a flat roof dormer window to the rear elevation. A separate dormer window serving the original part of the dwelling has also been constructed and the Council are concerned that, together, these windows form a dominant feature. The dormer window serving the original dwelling to No 141 has been built under permitted development rights. While the Council may have no record regarding this, as permitted development this would be outside of the Council's control and as such does not form part of the development proposals before me.
 10. The dormer window proposed as part of the new dwelling extends the full height of the roof, from eaves to ridge level. However, does not extend across the full width of the roof of the proposed new dwelling. I do not consider this dominate the rear elevation of the proposed new dwelling, rather it represents a simple upwards extension in a typical dormer design.
 11. In combination with the adjacent dormer, the mass and bulk of the rear roofs of this part of the terrace is increased and this is visible from Parkside Close as well as from neighbouring properties and their gardens. However, views are limited to a small section of Parkside Close by the presence of the railway line and views from neighbouring properties would largely be oblique. Moreover, in light of my findings above, I consider it would be unreasonable withhold planning permission on this basis.
 12. For these reasons I find that proposals would not give rise to any harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development accords with Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan (2004) which, in combination, seek to protect and enhance the built environment and requiring that the siting, design and external appearance of the development is compatible with the character of the existing building and adjacent buildings. The development is also consistent with the guidance within the Design and Development Control Guidelines in respect of roof extensions.

Conditions

13. The Council have put forward conditions relating to timescales, drawings and materials. However, as the development has largely been completed, the imposition of such conditions is not necessary. I have therefore allowed the

appeal and granted planning permission in accordance with the terms of the application and the plans within it.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Searson

INSPECTOR