



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 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/22/3311438

4 Aldwick Close, Bexley, SE9 3UE.

- 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 Yadam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 22/02219/FUL, dated 1 September 2022 was refused by notice dated 8 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is for alterations to the roofline incorporating a rear dormer to create rooms in the roofspace.
-

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 thereby the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 4 Aldwick Close is a semi-detached chalet style house with a single storey rear extension. Alterations have previously been undertaken to provide additional accommodation within the roof space. The dwelling is located in a small residential cul-de-sac characterised by similar designed semi-detached dwellings.
5. The appellant proposes replacing the existing small second-floor dormer with a large box dormer to improve the headroom in the second-floor bedroom. The

proposed dormer would sit immediately above the existing first floor dormer. The new dormer has been designed to replicate the form and appearance of the existing first floor dormer.

6. The proposed dormer, when combined with the existing would appear more as a gable extension that would virtually subsume the rear roof slope of the host property.
7. Further, due to its size, form and overall design it would appear as a large and incongruous addition. That would seriously denude the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and detract from the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses.
8. Although the dormer is to be built on the rear roof slope it would nevertheless be open to, albeit limited, public view from Foots Cray Road behind. While the dormer would not impact on Aldwick Close it would nevertheless thereby be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would for the reasons given cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property, the semi-detached pair and thereby the character and appearance of the area.
10. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan Policies SP5 and DP11, all of which seek, amongst other things, to secure high quality design for new development.

Other Matters

11. From the evidence before me and my observations on site I appreciate that there are examples of similar dormers in the surrounding area. However, their existence is not an appropriate justification for permitting the dormer proposal here which I have considered on its individual planning merits in the context of the host property.
12. I note that the Council, found that the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. Based on what I have seen and read I would not seek to disagree with its findings on this issue. However, the absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations and, as such, I have given this matter very little weight in my decision.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR

