



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3311082

14 Danson Crescent, Welling, Bexley DA16 2AT

- 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 Marcus Worrell against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01916/FUL, dated 13 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the removal of existing shallow pitch roof, formation of mansard roof incorporating living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached house whose plot, along with those of the dwellings on either side, are angled at approximately 45 degrees to the street. It has previously been the subject of significant extension, although this appears to be predominantly to the rear of the property and the appeal dwelling appears to retain much of its original appearance when viewed from the front, and in wider views from the street.
4. The local area is predominantly made up of two storey semidetached houses with the occasional bungalow, including the neighbouring detached bungalow at 14A Danson Crescent (No.14A). Whilst there is a significant variation in the design of properties in the area, its character is defined by the general two storey nature of the houses and the cohesive character this lends to the spatial characteristics of the area and the local roofscape and streetscene.

5. The proposal would involve the removal of the existing shallow pitched hipped roof over the original dwelling and its replacement with a mansard roof form with gable ends, which would slightly step down and extend over an area of flat roof above an existing side extension. The proposed roof would incorporate 4 dormer windows to the front roof slope and 4 dormer windows to the rear.
6. Whilst the proposal would unify the roof profile of the appeal dwelling under a single roof form, it would involve the removal of the existing sympathetically scaled and recessive shallow pitch hipped roof. The proposed replacement roof form would not only result in a taller than existing roof but would also, due to the proposed mansard with gable end roof form and dormer windows, appear as a bulky addition to the existing house. This would result in the proposal appearing as a poorly massed addition, which would result in a disproportionate and dominating extension to the appeal dwelling.
7. The design and layout of the proposed dormers would not reflect the scale and positioning of the appeal dwelling's existing fenestration. This would result in the proposal appearing inconsistent and unsympathetic in relation to the existing design and form of the appeal dwelling.
8. Further, from the front and in the wider and extensive street views of the appeal dwelling afforded by its 45 degree angle to the street, the proposal would appear as a bulky, dominating and unduly prominent and incongruous addition to the appeal property and an intrusive addition to the otherwise cohesive character of the local roofscape and street scene.

Living Conditions

9. No.14A sits forward of the appeal dwelling and is, similarly on a plot angled 45 degrees to the street. The plot is also irregular in shape and the appeal dwelling steps slightly in behind No.14A. However, the proposal would not sit above that part of the appeal dwelling that steps in behind No.14A.
10. The proposal would be visible from the rear rooms and garden at No.14A. However, due to the setting back of the proposed roof form and gable end from the boundary of the appeal dwelling from 14A, it would not result in an overbearing impact or feeling of enclosure that would be experienced by the occupiers of No.14A as oppressive. The proposal would not, therefore, result in any significant harm to their living conditions. In this context absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area. this would fail to accord the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines 2, as appended to The Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) (the UDP), policies ENV39, H9 of the UDP, policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that developments, including extensions, are of a high standard of design and integrate with the local area.

Other Matters

12. Whilst the Council has found that the proposal would be contrary to policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), I have not done so, as this policy does not relate

directly to development proposals, but to the Council's adoption of design policy and design management.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR