
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/17/3176695

26 Braywood Road, London SE9 2RH

- 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 Stuart Tough against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 17/00469/FUL, dated 20 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension to provide a garage and utility room, alterations to roofline including a rear dormer extension and 3 rooflight windows to the rear roof slope and 4 to the front roof slope to provide rooms in the roofspace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant has submitted plans detailing amendments to the proposed development. These amended plans are dated 22 May 2017, after the Council determined the planning application. The amendments would be a departure from the original scheme and have not been subject to formal consideration by the Council or consultation with nearby residents. Given the lack of opportunity for comment on the revised drawings, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans originally submitted with the application.
3. I have altered the description of development to that given on the Council's decision notice as agreed on the appeal form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the bungalow and wider street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated in a prominent position on the outside bend of a suburban residential street. The street comprises a mixture of semi-detached houses and bungalows which mainly have hipped roofs. Viewed from the front, whilst some alterations and extensions are evident, it seems to me that the various pairs of dwellings have retained a broad sense of balance and symmetry in their appearance. The appeal dwelling and adjoining bungalow are finished in similar materials and have forward projecting rooms with lower
-

rooflines. This contributes to the symmetry of the pairing and helps to maintain a broad visual rhythm along the road which adds to the character of the street scene.

6. The proposed extension would serve to raise the main ridgeline of the bungalow and alter the side elevation from a hipped to gable end. I am firmly of the view that this would result in a dominant and unsympathetic extension, in what is a highly visible location, that would unbalance the design of the pairing and appear at odds with its surroundings including the symmetry of the similarly designed bungalow pairing on the opposite side of the road.
7. The appellant has referred to a series of roof extensions that have been constructed in the area, including hip to gable and dormer alterations, which he regards as no better in design terms than the appeal proposal. However these developments do not appear to be in the immediate street scene. In any event they do not justify the harm I have identified in this case which I must consider on its own merits. Reference is also made to the possibility of an identical scheme being implemented to the adjoining bungalow. However no such proposal is before me for consideration.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the bungalow and wider street scene. Accordingly it would be in conflict with Policy H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan 2004, the Council's Design and Development Control guidelines and the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they seek to promote high quality design compatible with existing and adjacent buildings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has raised the concern that he considers the standard of communication from the Council in relation to this case to have been very poor. This, however, is a matter that would need to be addressed with the Council directly and is not for my deliberations in this appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having taken into consideration all other points raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR