



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2021

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3277760

152 Bladindon Drive, Bexley, DA5 3BW

- 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 O and Mrs M Slobodyanyk against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref: 21/00578/FUL, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is to extend existing right side roof dormer. The same as our neighbour at 150 Bladindon Drive has.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the street scene.

Reasons

3. No.152 Bladindon Drive is an attractive two storey semi-detached house located near the junction with the Drive and in a residential area. Houses in the vicinity vary in design, form and appearance with many having been altered and extended. No.152 has an existing side dormer and its adjoining property of No.154 has a small dormer at its elevation facing The Drive. The neighbouring semi-detached dwellings of Nos.148 and 150 Bladindon Drive both have large side dormers which are visible from the road. No.152 is set slightly back on its site compared to No.150.
4. Bexley Core Strategy policy CS01 seeks to achieve sustainable development, whilst policy CS06 relates to the Sidcup geographic area and includes the need to ensure that new development is in keeping with the character of family housing areas. Policies ENV39 and H9 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) refer to the need for development to have high design standards and to respect the amenity of neighbours.
5. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed dormer extension regarding its effect on the amenity of neighbours. I see no reason to disagree in view of the siting of the dormer in relation to its adjacent neighbour at

No.150 Bladindon Drive and potential to require obscure glazing for the proposed bathroom window to prevent any overlooking.

6. The Council has drawn my attention to its UDP Design and Development Control Guidelines (the Guidelines). The pair of semi-detached houses have a general chalet style design. The proposed dormer extension would match the overall design of the existing dormer. However, it would detract from the appearance of the current catslide roof, which is a particular design feature of the house. According to the appellants, the dormer would be "set-back slightly from the front elevation". Nevertheless, in view of the lack of a substantial set-back and its scale and massing, the proposed dormer would not appear as a subordinate extension and would be detrimental to the integrity in design and balance of the semi-detached pair of dwellings. Although there are mature trees near the dwellings, they would not totally shield the view of the proposed dormer extension, which would be prominent in the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with part 2 of the Guidelines concerning extensions to houses.
7. Although Nos.148 and 150 Bladindon Drive have large side dormers which are flush with the front elevation of the semi-detached pair of houses they appear to be well established. I accept that that dormers of such a design were allowed prior to the adoption of the Council's current policies and guidelines and in some cases to enable balancing of a semi-detached pair of dwellings. Therefore, the dormer extensions at Nos.148 and 150 form insufficient precedence to justify allowing the appeal proposal before me.
8. The proposed dormer extension would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling, the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the street scene, contrary to Core Strategy policies CS01 and CS06 and UDP policies ENV39 and H9. It would also conflict with the objectives of achieving good design in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. I have taken all other matters raised into account and acknowledge the appellants requirement for additional living space. However, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR