



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3238668

7 Carisbrooke Avenue, Bexley DA5 3HS

- 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 Patrick Hort against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 19/01245/FUL, dated 23 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Conversion of roof into habitable space to include rear dormer window'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For clarity, I have taken the name of the appellant from the appeal form as it is more precise.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling comprises a previously extended 2-storey semi-detached house on a residential street. The host dwelling is of brick construction at ground floor with render above with decorative timber detailing on the front facing gable, and a tiled hipped roof. The proposal seeks alterations to the roof, through the introduction of a half hip / half gable and a dormer extension on the rear roof slope.
5. I note the Council's concerns in the Officer Report and Decision Notice focus on the alterations to the roof. I agree with the Council in this regard, as during my visit, I found that the proposed rear dormer would not be particularly visible from the street and would therefore have a limited effect on the surrounding area. Additionally, I do not consider that the proposed rear dormer would harm the appearance of the host dwelling. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
6. The host dwelling forms part of a small group of semi-detached houses that are similar in design, although some are located on the opposite side of the road to the host dwelling. Nonetheless, the wider street scene consists of a mixture of house types, where hipped roofs are a predominant feature that are clearly visible when viewed from the front. This forms a strong and positive

characteristic in the street scene, meaning I consider that the appeal site is located within a group of similar properties that have maintained a sense of rhythm and balance and are then supported by other hipped roof dwellings in the street.

7. The proposed development through its design and form, with particular regard to the half hip / half gable end would result in an incongruous addition that would dominate the roof, fundamentally altering its shape and unbalancing its form and relationship with its neighbouring dwellings, in particular the adjoining house. I note that the appellant asserts that the symmetry between the host dwelling and the adjoining house is limited due to the erection of the 2-storey side extension at the host dwelling. Nevertheless, I find that the proposed development would further harm this relationship. The resulting significant adverse effect on the host dwelling would be readily visible in the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. My attention has been drawn to other properties in the immediate locality of the appeal site¹. In the case of No 19 and No 50, I note that reference numbers² have been provided. However, in all cases, whilst noting the presence of these properties, relatively little detail has been provided regarding the particular planning backgrounds to these schemes. Without such information a full and detailed comparison between these developments and the case before me cannot be made, except insofar, as I was able to observe and assess the sites at my visit. In any event, the fact that these properties may exist is not a reason, on its own, to allow otherwise unacceptable development.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of 'Saved' Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2004, the associated Design and Development Control Guidelines 2 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I note the assertion from the appellant that the scheme subject of this appeal has been submitted to other local planning authorities (LPA's) for a property of the same style as the host dwelling and found to be acceptable. However, no examples have been provided, and in any event, even if similar development has been approved in other LPA's I find this to be of little consequence in the determination of this appeal. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR

¹ No's 9, 14, 16, 19 and 50 Carisbrooke Avenue

² No 19: (00/00050/FUL) and No 50: (16/01647/FUL)