



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2019

by Mr Kim Bennett DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3228168

75 Cold Blow Crescent, Bexley DA5 2DR

- 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 & Mrs Griggs against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 19/00445/FUL, dated 22 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached bungalow located on the western side of Cold Blow Crescent. Although the Crescent has a mixture of two storey properties elsewhere, in this part of the road there are bungalows on both sides of the road and all of similar design with distinctive hipped roofs and hipped roof front projections.
4. The appellant argues that the proposed side dormer would be below the ridge line and set well back so that it would not be prominent and therefore maintain the existing appearance and character of the bungalow. Whilst I acknowledge that setting the dormer back would mitigate its impact, it would still be quite apparent in the street scene, particularly because of the slightly elevated nature of the property above road level. Its large size and flat roof nature would disrupt the unaltered appearance of the roof of the bungalow and I agree with the Council that it would appear visually discordant as a result, especially since there are no other side dormers in the properties on this side of the road.
5. Although I noted that some properties have extended the main hipped roofs to the rear, the essential character of the buildings have been maintained and have not caused the same visual harm that the proposed dormer would. In that respect, I do not consider that using matching materials would be sufficient to overcome that harm.

6. My attention has been drawn to two other properties in close proximity where side dormers have also been constructed. The full details of those developments are not before me, but in the case of No 56 Cold Blow Crescent, it clearly shows the harm that has resulted in a side dormer, albeit larger than that proposed, which has paid little regard to the character of the existing property. It is not therefore a good reason to cause additional harm within the street scene. The side dormer to No 60 Cold Blow Crescent also disrupts the roofscape, but is significantly smaller in size than that proposed at the appeal site. My attention was also drawn to the rebuilding of No 93 Cold Blow Crescent to a two storey house. However, I noted that it adjoined existing two storey houses at the end of the Crescent and therefore different considerations apply.
7. I acknowledge that there are some apparent anomalies in permitted development rights between bungalows and two storey houses. However, that is a matter of fact in respect of national legislation and I have reached my finding above based on the merits of an application requiring planning permission.
8. I am sympathetic to the needs of the appellants in terms of the enhanced accommodation that the proposal would provide, but I note that the Council raises no objections to the rear extension, nor to the rear facing windows at first floor. Having assessed those issues at my site visit, I see no reason to disagree. However, it is the side dormer which in my view causes the unacceptable visual impact and which would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the immediate area.
9. Having regard to the above, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2004, Policies CS01 and CS05 of its Core Strategy 2012, and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, in that it would not be compatible with the character of existing buildings or the surrounding area and the details would not complement the local architectural character.
10. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR