



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2021

by Julie Dale Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3276634
66 Davenport Road, Sidcup DA14 4PW

- 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 Hanzak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 21/00212/FUL, dated 21 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed ground floor rear extension, two-storey side extension, porch, hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 66 Davenport Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached, two-storey house with a hipped roof. The proposed extensions would represent considerable alterations to the house at ground, first floor and roof levels.
4. UDP Policy¹ ENV39 seeks to protect and enhance the quality of the built environment by ensuring, among other things, that alterations and extensions are of a high standard of design and compatible with the surrounding area and do not adversely affect the street scene. UDP Policy H9 also requires extensions and alterations to satisfy a set of criteria, including, design and external appearance that is compatible with the character of the existing building and those adjacent to it.
5. The decision notice refers to Core Strategy² Policy CS02 which relates to the Bexleyheath geographical region of the Borough. Policy CS06 is referred to in the Council's report which refers to the Sidcup geographical region. It seems likely that the reference to CS02 is an error but this has not been clarified. I

¹ Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan, Adopted 28 April 2004 (UDP). Unitary Development Plan Design and Development Control Guidelines.

² London Borough of Bexley Local Development Framework Development Plan Document Bexley Core Strategy, Adopted 22 February 2012.

have not taken the Core Strategy policies into account given the lack of clarity and in any event the issue I have identified is addressed in the UDP policies referred to.

6. Whilst individual elements of the proposal may be acceptable, the overall scheme proposed would be cumbersome and excessive. The roof alterations, in particular would be totally out of keeping with the design of the house, its inappropriateness highlighted by No 66 being one half of a semi-detached pair of houses. The proposal fails to respect the design of the existing house or its location and as such would conflict with the aims of policies ENV39 and H9.
7. The appellant refers to an approved Lawful Development Certificate for alterations to the roof incorporating a hip to gable alteration, a rear dormer with Juliet balcony and rooflights. The applicant also refers to a planning approval for a part one / part two-storey front side and rear extension³. Although full details of these are not submitted, the appellant has included rear elevations for both proposals.
8. I have considered the impact of the alterations that have previously been approved by the Council and weighed these against the proposal. Whilst the appellant sees the proposal as one amalgamating the previous approvals, plus adding more roof space, the cumulative effect would create a dwelling that would appear incongruous in the street scene, totally at odds with the character of the area and representative of poorly designed additions to a traditional styled semi-detached house.
9. I have taken into account the National Planning Policy Framework⁴ in terms of housing provision and sustainable development but the Framework also encourages high quality design. Also, I note the examples of other extensions cited by the appellant but I have limited information about them. I have taken all other matters raised into account but none alter my conclusion.
10. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, it would conflict with UDP policies ENV39 and H9 and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

³ Reference Nos 20/02739/LDCP and 20/02738/FUL.

⁴ Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, 2021 (the Framework).