
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/17/3180480
96 Farnham Road, Welling DA16 1LQ

- 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 Boniface against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 17/0811/FUL, dated 6 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion raising the hip to a gable with a dormer to rear and roof lights in the front pitch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion raising the hip to a gable with a dormer to rear and roof lights in the front pitch at 96 Farnham Road, Welling DA16 1LQ in accordance with the terms of the application dated 6 April 2017 and subject to the conditions below:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: FARNHAM/VKY/PLAN/03-17/D1; FARNHAM/VKY/PLAN/03-17/D2; FARNHAM/VKY/PLAN/03-17/D3.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene with particular regard to the proposed hip to gable extension.

Reasons

3. Farnham Road is characterised by semi-detached dwellings with predominantly hipped roofs. The appeal site is within part of the street where there is a significant stagger in the forward building line of successive pairs of dwellings, due to the curved alignment of the road. The effect of this is that the appeal
-

property is significantly screened by neighbouring dwellings when viewed from oblique angles in either direction along the road. With the exception of directly opposite, the appeal site is not therefore particularly prominent.

4. The proposed extension would replace the existing hipped roof with a gable design in a street where there are only a very small number of similar exceptions. However from my visit it was evident that the appeal site has previously received a double storey extension to the side and porch extension to the front. This has diluted the sense of symmetry with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling to a degree. When considering the staggered orientation of dwellings as described above, and despite the loss of space at roof level, I am not persuaded that the proposal would draw the eye or appear significantly harmful to the visual rhythm and cohesiveness of the street scene. The extension would be consistent with the ridge and forward plane of the main roof and accordingly would be subordinate in scale to the existing building.
5. I therefore conclude, having regard to the specific circumstances of the appeal site, that the proposed extension would not appear excessively bulky or result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. It would therefore conform with Policy H9 of the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004 insofar as it requires residential extensions to be compatible with the character of existing and adjacent buildings in terms of siting, design and external appearance.
6. I acknowledge that the proposal would not accord with specific guidance set out in the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines 2 which advises that roof extensions should follow the pattern of the main roof. However I consider that the circumstances of this case, as set out above, justify a more relaxed approach being taken.

Conditions and Conclusion

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.
8. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension are needed to provide certainty and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR