



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3258097

2 Harborough Avenue, Sidcup, DA15 8HP

- 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 Lawrence against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01093/FUL, dated 15 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is to extend his 2 bed semi-detached property, proposing a first floor side extension, alongside a loft conversion with hip to gable extensions to boundary.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms part of a short row of two-storey houses of similar design characteristics to other rows of houses that make up the street scene along Harborough Avenue.
4. The first floor extension would sit flush with the existing first floor building line in commonality with a number of other extensions I viewed within close quarters. However, the use of a gable end roof would imbalance the symmetry of this row.
5. Despite the use of sympathetic materials, the proposed gable end would not appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling, but instead appear as an uncharacteristic form of development that would be harmful to the appeal property, and as a consequence, it would not respect the character of the general area.
6. Both dwellings of No 23 and No 25 have undergone extensions to erect gable end roofs, although these sit side by side and are not comparable to that of the appeal proposal. Similarly, the other Council decisions brought to my attention are also not directly comparable to the proposal before me as they do not

share precisely the same circumstances as the appeal property, and therefore I apply limited weight to these examples.

7. To conclude, I find harm would arise to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area as a result of the proposal. It would therefore not comply with Policy H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004 in its design aims, and Policy ENV39 to protect the built environment and Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy 2012 in its broad aims for development to enhance the surrounding locality.

Other Matters

8. The benefits of an enlarged home to the appellant's family are noted, however, this does not lead me to reach a favourable conclusion.
9. Whilst the scheme would lead to no harm arising to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, an absence of harm is a neutral matter which weighs neither for nor against the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

10. The appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR