



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2021

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/21/3269503 26 Dartford Road, Bexley DA5 2AZ

- 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 J Davies against the decision of London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/02250/FUL, dated 2 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear and part first floor extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). It replaces the previous version published in February 2019 as referred to in the Council's Decision Notice. The Framework represents the Government's up-to-date planning policies for England and how they should be applied. I have had regard to the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof. It has a prominent single storey projection that incorporates a timber framed gable section. It is located in a predominantly residential area that is made up of detached and semi-detached bungalows and houses.
5. On this section of Dartford Road, the properties are predominantly of a traditional design, mainly incorporating hipped roofs and exposed timber frames. For the section of Dartford Road after Baldwyns Park Baptist Church, the character of the built environment changes to be more varied and being of less traditional in appearance.
6. The proposed extensions and alterations would substantially alter the current appearance of the dwelling. Incorporating a flat roof, cedar cladding and vertically emphasised fenestration, it would provide a clear contemporary appearance to the dwelling being of a modern architectural style. Such features

are not prevalent in either the adjoining or surrounding properties of the immediate area.

7. I do find some architectural merit in the design of the resulting dwelling in isolation, however in the context of the surrounding area, particularly in terms of the design of the surrounding properties I have outlined above, it would appear harmfully out of character. The contemporary design would jar with the traditional design of the surrounding properties, appearing alien and incongruous.
8. Therefore, due to its design, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies ENV39 and H9, and Design and Development Control Guideline 2 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) and Policy CS06 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012). These policies require, amongst other things, that the design of development should be compatible with the character of the existing and adjacent buildings, and the surrounding area.
9. The proposed development would also be contrary to the Framework, which outlines, amongst other things, that decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment, and that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has referred to a number of dwellings in the wider area including recent planning decisions. Although these developments have some similarities to the proposed development in terms of their design, these sites are however some distance from the appeal site and would not be seen in conjunction with it. They are therefore of limited weight in the appeal, which I have in any event determined on its own individual planning merits.
11. The appellant has referred to the need for the proposed development in relation to possible family members residing with them in future. This is however a matter of personal circumstance that seldom carries significant weight in the decision-making process that is primarily concerned with land use planning matters. Either way, such personal circumstances do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
12. Although the appellant had the thoughtful consideration to discuss their proposals with their neighbours, any lack of objection is a neutral factor in the balance. Regardless, the Council's consultation exercise outlines that objections were received.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR