
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021 by Emma Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Zoe Raygen DipURP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3279821

32 Westmoreland Avenue, Welling DA16 2QD

- 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 & Mrs Mark Small against the decision of London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 21/00891/FUL, dated 18 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a part single storey rear extension, part loft conversion to habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single storey rear extension, part loft conversion to habitable room at 32 Westmoreland Avenue, Welling DA16 2QD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00891/FUL, dated 18 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: JE/11-08-2020/BEX/PL Rev B and Site Location Plan.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials to match that of the host dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration in my decision-making, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey end of terrace dwelling with a hipped roof. The surrounding area is residential in nature, primarily with rows of terraced dwellings that are similar in size and appearance. The proposed development includes a single storey rear extension and loft conversion with a change in the angle of the roof slope, a rear dormer and a front rooflight.
6. The angle of the hipped roof would increase from 32 degrees to 55 degrees to allow space for the loft conversion. Although this would increase the massing of the roof, the addition would be modest. Furthermore, the hipped roof form and the gap between the host dwelling and the neighbouring property at roof level would be retained. It would therefore not have a significant impact on the appearance of the host dwelling.
7. This change in angle would also vary from the hipped roof at the other end of the terrace and the majority of other hipped roof forms within Westmoreland Avenue. However, due to the height of the dwelling, from street level this variation would appear minimal and not an incongruous addition. Therefore, it would not disrupt any symmetry within the terrace and would have a limited impact on the overall streetscene.
8. The Council raise no objections to the proposed single storey rear extension, rear dormer or front rooflight and I find no reason to disagree with this finding.
9. Therefore, for the reasons above I conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and would not be contrary to Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012) and Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan (2004). These policies seek to ensure that the building mass of new development enhances the character of the surrounding locality, the siting, design and external appearance is compatible with the character of existing and adjacent buildings and it is of a high standard of design.
10. It would also comply with the Design and Development Control Guidelines (2004) which states that loft extensions should not, by reason of design or massing, be detrimental to the form of the existing roof.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Emma Grierson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR