



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3249878

178 Long Lane, Bexleyheath, DA7 5AQ

- 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 Mrs Sebiotimo against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02928/FUL, dated 4 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2020.
 - The development is a dormer roof extension with gable end.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. On my site visit I observed that the works have commenced and appear to have been completed. I have therefore considered this appeal on a retrospective basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated on the northern side of Long Lane. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of residential and retail uses. The wider area is defined by its suburban appearance and is mostly comprised of semi-detached housing and detached bungalows.
 6. The appeal dwelling forms part of a pair of semi-detached properties that would have both originally featured hipped roofs. As the works to which this appeal relates have already been carried out, the appeal property now features an enlarged hip to gable roof, a rear dormer and three rooflights within the front elevation. Although the appellant's appeal statement asserts that the hip to gable roof alteration and box dormer was carefully designed and executed to
-

address the lack of space available within the original hipped roof, I find it has unbalanced the appearance of the dwelling. The roof profile fails to maintain the uniformity of the pair of semi-detached properties the appeal dwelling forms part of. It appears mismatched and due to its visibility within the public realm thus constitutes a prominent adverse alteration.

7. Furthermore, the gable-ended roof also jars with the neighbouring hipped roof at No. 176 and the other properties on the northern side of Long Lane which mostly feature hipped roofs. Whilst the appellant states that the development is typical of the area, I have not been provided with evidence that this is the case nor did I observe examples of similar alterations in the vicinity of the site. In my view therefore, the development has a negative effect on the character and appearance of the area.
8. I note the agent's comments on the feasibility of alternative designs however this has had no bearing on my assessment of the case before me.
9. Given the above, I find the development has resulted in poor design and unacceptably harms the appearance of the host dwelling as well as the established character and appearance of the area. I therefore consider that the proposed development would conflict with Policies ENV9 and H9, the Design and Development Control Guideline 2 of Bexley's Unitary Development Plan (the 'Local Plan'), Policy CS02 of the Core Strategy, and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which together seek to ensure that extensions and alterations are compatible with the character of the host dwelling, adjacent buildings and the surrounding area.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. 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