



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3242726

8 Selwyn Crescent, Welling, Kent DA16 2AP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Z Ravshanov against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01417/FUL dated 10 June 2019 was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019.
 - The proposed development is erection of single storey rear extension, two storey side extension with porch to front, loft conversion into en-suite bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling when seen in the context of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms the left-hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses. The appeal dwelling and No.6 share a hipped roof design which gives a sense of balance and uniformity. The majority of surrounding properties share a similar configuration which provides a sense of consistency and gives a pleasant visual characteristic when viewed from the street scene.
5. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a gable roof. This would be a considerable deviation from the characteristic hipped roof of the host dwelling and the roofscape of the surrounding area, disrupting the sense of consistency. The proposal would further unbalance the semi-detached properties the appeal dwelling is a part of, which would detract from the symmetry of the pair at roof level. Overall, the gable roof would appear as an incongruous form of development that fails to respond to the host dwelling and local character.
6. The appellant has provided photos of houses, which appear to be in Selwyn Crescent, with differing roof forms. However, the photographs presented all

show the hipped roof forms of the main houses being retained. The appellant has also provided photographs of properties with hipped to gable roof extensions in a different area to the appeal site. As the context of these sites would differ from the appeal site, they are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal.

7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling when seen in the context of the surrounding area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan, Adopted 28 April 2004, and the associated Design and Development Control Guidelines, which seek to ensure developments are compatible with the character of the surrounding area and the existing building. It would also conflict with Policy CS07 of the Bexley Core Strategy, Adopted 22 February 2012, which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character. This is echoed in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. Whilst I note the position of the extension would not impact the neighbouring property, and that details of materials and colours of the roof alterations could be addressed through a planning condition, these factors do not outweigh the harm the proposal presents.
9. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant's need to extend the property to accommodate his family and avoid relocating, these personal circumstances are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.
10. The appellant states the alterations to the roof would achieve an acceptable height for headroom and make more efficient use of space. However, there is no persuasive evidence before me to suggest this cannot be secured without the proposed gable end.

Recommendation and Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR