



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2017

**by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 25 October 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/17/3179702**  
**26 Stirling Close, Sidcup DA14 6RP**

- 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 J Uden against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
  - The application Ref:17/00724/FUL, dated 29 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is the formation of rooms in roofspace incorporating three dormer windows to front roofslope and one full-width dormer window with Juliet balcony to rear roofslope.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice as it provides a full and accurate description of the development.

### Main Issue

3. The Council raised no objection to the proposed dormer window with Juliet balcony on the rear roof slope. Based on the evidence before me, and from my own observations, I consider that the proposed dormer window with Juliet balcony would be a suitable addition to the existing dwelling. Against this, I therefore find that the main issue of the appeal is the effect of the dormer windows on the front roof slope on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semidetached 2-storey dwelling, located on the southern side of Stirling Close. The area is predominately residential in character, although the front elevation of the host dwelling faces the grounds of Sidcup Sports Club.
5. There is a mix of both detached and semidetached dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the site, which vary in both scale and orientation. Despite this variety, uniformity in terms of the simple lines of the roof slopes is evident.
6. Policy H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan 2004 (the UDP) and the associated Design and Development Control Guidelines (the DDCG),

amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is compatible with both the character of the existing building and any adjacent buildings. It is acknowledged that proposed pitched roof design of the front dormers has been selected in order to complement the existing roof pitch.

7. Nevertheless, the three proposed dormers would be sizeable additions and would not appear subordinate to the existing roof slope. Instead the dormers would present a bulky, top heavy appearance to the front elevation and would significantly alter the traditional front roof slope of the host dwelling.
8. Despite being constructed from sympathetic materials, the proposed dormers would disrupt the existing general symmetry between both the host dwelling and the adjoining dwelling. The loss of symmetry would be further increased by the middle dormer being significantly larger and more prominent than the two proposed outer dormers.
9. This loss of symmetry would be evident from Stirling Close on the approach to the site in both directions. As the only example of such an arrangement within the street scene to which the host dwelling belongs, the proposal would be an obtrusive and discordant element in the context of the host dwelling, the adjacent dwelling and wider street scene.
10. It is acknowledged that the proposal is required in order for the appellant to increase the amount of family accommodation. However, the proposal would appear as an incongruous form of development which would materially erode the overall balance of the wider street scene and as such would fail to complement the appearance of the appeal site. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the design objectives of Policy H9 of the UDP and guidance contained within the DDCG.

## **Conclusion**

11. No harm has been identified in relation to the proposed dormer window with Juliet balcony on the rear roof slope. However, the harm to character and appearance of the surrounding area as a result of the proposed three dormers on the front roof slope is decisive.
12. For the above reasons, and having regards to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Helen Cassini*

INSPECTOR