



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/20/3254688

83 Holmsdale Grove, Bexleyheath DA7 6PA

- 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 Julie Hall against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00892/FUL, dated 17 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a tight grain of semi-detached and short rows of two-storey houses within a street scene of similar house types with a limited number of more modern detached houses present.
4. The proposed alteration to form a gable end to the roof plane would distort the original roof that is traditional to this pair of semi-detached houses, and both remain largely unaltered with significant symmetry.
5. Although the internal space would be increased it would not appear as a subordinate addition to the dwelling but appear as an uncharacteristic form of development in this location that would be harmful to the appeal property, and as a consequence, it would not respect the character of the general area.
6. In contrast to the appeal decision brought to my attention which is located on a different street, there are very few examples of alterations to gable ends within the street scene that are comparable to the proposal before me.
7. The scale of the proposed rear dormer extending over the new roof, would encompass the entire width of the rear roof slope. It would add considerable mass and bulk that would be visible from the street scene and dominate it. Given its largescale massing, the rear dormer would be visible from a considerable number of other private gardens. Despite the use of matching

materials, overall, it would appear as a discordant and obtrusive feature to the host dwelling.

8. There may be a fall-back position with regards to a rear dormer at the site although this is not the same proposal as the one before me as it is a smaller scale. However, as is my duty, I have considered the development before me and reached my own conclusion.
9. Therefore, 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 not comply with Policy H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004 in its design aims, and Policy ENV39 to protect the built environment or Policy CS02 of the Bexley Core Strategy 2012 in its broad aims for development to be in keeping with the local area. Finally, it would not represent well-designed places in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. 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

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR