

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

**by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 02 March 2021.**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/20/3260457**

### **7 Warwick Close, Bexley DA5 3NL**

- 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 A Dunlop against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
  - The application Ref 20/01914/FUL, dated 8 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2020.
  - The development proposed is part single/two storey front extension.
- 

## **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

## **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a small modern estate of similar property types and semi-detached dwellings. No 7 is located in a row of three detached dwellings at the end of the close.
  4. Policy H9 of the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan 2004 (the UDP) requires residential extensions to be compatible with the character of the existing and adjacent buildings, and to not result in overdevelopment in terms of scale and mass. Policy ENV39 of the UDP requires a high standard of design in new development, including extensions, while Policy CS01 of the London Borough of Bexley Core Strategy 2012, which concerns sustainable development, includes the requirement that development should maintain and improve suburban character. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly section twelve concerning good design.
  5. The *Design and Development Control Guidelines* provides more detailed guidance to support the implementation of development plan policies. This document says that front extensions of a greater depth than a porch should normally be avoided. Special circumstances where such extensions may be acceptable include detached houses on large plots with substantial space around the dwelling and for houses in streets with irregular building lines.
-

These should only be considered where the extension results in a positive townscape improvement and it respects the style and character of the original dwelling<sup>1</sup>.

6. Properties within Warwick Close are not entirely uniform but are of a similar size and display some common features, including front-facing gables. The appeal property has twin gables to the front and is one of the largest dwellings within the overall street scene. Its position on higher ground at the end of the cul-de-sac means it has some prominence within the street scene and in views from nearby dwellings.
7. The proposal involves new two storey elements, which would be of greater depth than a porch. The closest parts of Nos 6 and 7 are currently positioned on a similar front building line, while No 5 is further forward. However, this property is less visible in the street scene. As such, the principal visual relationship across the row of properties is between Nos 6 and 7.
8. The proposed additions would materially alter the size of the host dwelling by adding further bulk and mass to what is already a relatively large detached dwelling. The extent of additional development to the front, forward of No 6's building line, would result in No 7 appearing as a dominant and overbearing presence within the street scene, both in its own right and in relation to the neighbouring dwelling. Moreover, the forward projection of No 7 would not respect the planned layout of the original estate and would not, therefore, result in a positive townscape improvement, as required by the development control guidelines.
9. I acknowledge that the extension is intended to respect the design of the original dwelling through the use of the same gable form, the subordinate roof height to the main part of the dwelling and use of matching materials. However, the three main gables and a fourth smaller one formed by the porch, would create a more visually complex and bulky front elevation that would detract from the simpler and more uniform appearance of the existing dwelling. This incongruous appearance would be heightened by the altered dwelling's contrast with the simpler forms of the surrounding dwellings, most of which are unaltered. As such, it would be uncharacteristic of the built form within the surrounding area.
10. Therefore, for all these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to Policies H9 and ENV39 of the UDP and to Policy CS01 of the Core Strategy, referred to above.
11. I acknowledge that the proposed extensions are intended to create additional living space. However, these personal circumstances do not overcome the harm and conflict with development plan policies that I have found would result from the proposal.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 2.3.5(2).

**Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

*J Bell-Williamson*

INSPECTOR