



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3255671

62 Beechcroft Avenue, Bexleyheath DA7 6QS

- 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 Adam Draper against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00749/FUL, dated 25 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with alterations to roofline, front and rear dormers and two rooflights to front roof slope.
-

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 property and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof form that sits in an elevated position on land that slopes upwards on this side of Beechcroft Avenue. The area local to the appeal property is residential, made up of a variety of detached and semi-detached bungalows and two storey houses.
4. The proposed loft conversion would introduce a new gable ended roof form, with a large rear dormer that would align with the proposed gable ends and the existing rear wall of the appeal dwelling. The proposed small front dormer would sit partly within the existing roof and partly in that part of roof extended to create the proposed gable ended roof form.
5. Taken as a whole, the scale and massing of the proposed extended gable roof form with front dormer and the full width rear dormer extension, would result in a box like top heavy and unbalanced appearance, which would have the effect of fundamentally altering the existing character and appearance of the host dwelling. The proposal would not appear as a subsidiary addition to the host dwelling, but would result in an unsympathetic addition and alteration to the existing form of the host dwelling that would appear to dominate its appearance.

6. Due to the elevated position of the host dwelling and notwithstanding the large rear garden of the host property, the bulk and excessive scale of the proposal, would be unduly prominent in views of the property from both the public and private realm in the local area. This would not only be apparent in views of the host dwelling from the rear, where the large rear dormer would appear to be particularly evident, but would also be apparent in the oblique views of the property from along the street.
7. In these views the proposal would, due to its excessive scale and gable ended and box like rear roof form appear disproportionate and overly dominant. The proposal would, therefore, also be out of keeping in relation to the existing hipped roof of the host dwelling, which matches the roof forms found in the local area generally. This would result in an incongruous appearance within the context of properties that provide its immediate setting and make up the local street scene.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties in the local area with roof extensions and alterations, arguing that these examples serve as a precedent for the proposed extension. These examples show some significant extensions to bungalows and existing houses that demonstrate aspects of the proposal.
9. I find, however, that although these examples are set within a context similar to that of the host dwelling, none of these examples of development are directly comparable, or demonstrate an adverse impact on the character and appearance of their host property and the street scene equivalent to that which would result from the proposed extension to the host dwelling. I therefore give little weight to the appellant's arguments in this regard and I have considered the proposal on its own merits.
10. Consequently, I find that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and that of the local area, contrary to saved Policies ENV39 and H9 and the Design and Development Control Guideline 2 of Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan (2004), Policy CS02 of the London Borough of Bexley Core Strategy (2012) and Paragraph 124 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which collectively seek to ensure that development proposals are of good design in relation to the property to be extended and the local area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR