



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2020

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3249897

34 Avondale Road, Welling DA16 1NQ

- 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 Lee Covington against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00076/FUL, dated 11 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is for a "Two storey side and rear extension with alterations to roof including rear dormer window and 2x rooflight windows to the front roof slope and 1x to the rear slope. New front entrance door with canopy over and single storey rear extension".
-

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 host dwelling and that of the local area.

Procedural Matters

3. I have used the description of development from the London Borough of Bexley Council's decision notice, which, from my reading of the documents before me most accurately describes the proposal.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a semi-detached house located in an area of properties of similar design and scale, many of which appear to have been the subject of some alteration or extension. The proposal would extend the host dwelling by wrapping around the property in one piece and moving the main entrance from the side to the front of the dwelling.
5. The proposed side extension would align with the existing front elevation rather than being set back from it, which, when combined with the proposed continuation of the stepped-up eave of the existing dwelling and proposed gable end, would result in the appearance of a double fronted property.
6. Due to the proposed massing of the proposed gable end and rear dormer extension, the additional bulk proposed would result in the proposal being out of scale with the host dwelling and would appear as a dominating rather than

subservient extension. The single storey rear element of the extension would, however, be of modest scale and in keeping with the scale and form of the host dwelling.

7. Within the context of the semidetached pair the proposal would, due to its proposed bulk and gable end, appear incongruous and unbalanced. This dominating presence and unbalanced appearance would be discordant within the immediate street scene and local area, where modestly scaled dwellings and hipped roof forms are an important part of the established character.
8. Consequently, the proposal would, be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area and would be in conflict with policy CS05 of the London Borough of Bexley Core Strategy, saved policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan 2004 (the UDP) and the Design and Development Control Guidelines contained therein, which collectively seek to ensure that developments, are of an appropriate scale and subservient to the host building, relating sympathetically to the built surroundings and in keeping with local character.

Conclusion

9. Although the policies of the UDP are now of some age, they do accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), and I have given them significant weight in my considerations. Whilst the Framework places significant emphasis on maximising homeowners' freedom to alter and extend their properties to improve their living conditions, it also requires that new development should be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character
10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR