
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2021

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/20/3264783

9 Highfield Avenue, Erith, Kent DA8 1EL

- 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 T Dettmer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/01123/FUL, dated 20 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the existing single detached dwelling into a pair of semi-detached dwellings with associated extension at the front, additional dormers and altered fenestration.
-

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 the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow. It is situated in a residential area comprising a mix of semi-detached houses, terraced housing and bungalows. These properties are of varied appearance and have been altered and extended, in some cases to the detriment of their appearance and that of the area. Whilst the property has also been extended and altered, it retains a hipped roof and therefore reflects the scale, bulk and massing of the neighbouring bungalows.
4. The proposal would involve the formation of a prominent gable frontage and large windowless dormer additions in the side slopes of the roof close to the frontage. This would enable the property to be converted into a pair of 2-storey houses. The gable frontage and dormers would result in an overly prominent, cumbersome and alien form of development that would be at odds with the appearance of the neighbouring bungalows and harmful to the appearance of the host property.
5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to Saved Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Policy CS01 of the Bexley

Core Strategy Local Development Framework Development Plan Document (2012). Amongst other matters these policies seek development that is of a high standard of design compatible with the character of the surrounding area. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines.

6. I note that the proposal would make a small contribution to the supply of housing in the area and provide employment opportunities during the construction period. However, these benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

7. I recognise that the appeal proposal seeks to respond to the Council's reasons for refusing an earlier similar proposal¹. However, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR

¹ Application ref. 20/00496/FUL