



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/22/3313438

95 Murchison Avenue, Bexley, DA5 3LW.

- 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 K. Goodall against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 22/01650/FUL, dated 24 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension incorporating hip to gable alteration and rear box dormer and roof lights to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The London Borough of Bexley–Bexley Local Plan was adopted by the Council on 26 April 2023 (Local Plan). This has replaced the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 28 April 2004) and the London Borough of Bexley Local Development Framework Development Plan Document *Bexley Core Strategy* (Adopted 22 February 2012), such that the policies cited on the decision notice are no longer part of the development plan and have no weight. I have therefore determined the appeal having regard to the relevant policies within the Local Plan. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on this during the appeal.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and the terrace of which it is part.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 95 Murchison Avenue is a two-storey house at the end of a short terrace of four houses. It is built right up to the boundary to number 93. The houses at either end of the terrace have hipped roofs. It is located in a residential area characterised by similar two-storey terraced houses. The properties have been subject to various alterations and extensions over time.
5. Number 95 has previously been extended with a side addition, resulting in the construction of a parapet to the flank wall and a full width, two-storey, flat roof rear addition.

6. The appellant proposes a hip to gable extension, large box dormer to the rear roof slope along with two-rooflights in the front roof slope.
7. The Council raise no objection to the two rooflights to the front roof slope. As other properties in the street have similar roof lights, and as they would be small and well placed on the front roof slope I concur with the Council's finding on this matter.
8. I appreciate that the previous side extension and the step in the roof line of the terrace, due to the topography of the road, has had some, albeit limited, impact on the symmetry of the terrace. Nevertheless, the proposed hip to gable alteration would further denude the existing three-dimensional form of the host property and thereby the symmetry of the terrace of which it is part.
9. Although the proposed box dormer would sit just above the eaves line of the dwelling it would only be marginally shorter than the roof slope in which it would be placed and would extend up to the ridge line. For these reasons the proposed dormer would dominate the roof as extended and thereby cause further harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling.
10. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and the terrace of which it is part. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, Local Plan Policies SP5 and DP11, all of which seek, amongst other things, to secure good design for new development.

Other Matters

11. I have regard to the appellant's desire to provide additional bedroom accommodation for his growing family. However, given the harm that I have identified I can only give this consideration limited weight in my determination.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR