



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2023

by N Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.12.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/23/3330851

172A Murchison Avenue, BEXLEY, DA5 3LL

- 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 Hoskins against the decision of London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 23/01363/FUL, dated 9 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable loft extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The roof forms in this area are generally hipped and where properties have been extended to the side a hip has been included or is of a lower roof form, as can be seen within the example street scene photographs provided by the appellant. Extending the roof to form a gable end would unbalance the appearances of this small terrace and would introduce a roof form uncommon within the surrounding area. The gabling and creation of a rear dormer would dominate the roof of the dwelling. As such, its overall size would not appear as a subordinate addition to the original dwelling.
5. The dormer extension would be set down from the main ridge line, away from the eaves, set in from one side and constructed of matching materials. Nonetheless, taking the roof extension as a whole it would create an unsympathetic form of development out of keeping with the other roof forms in the area. Its overall size and discordant design would result in a development that would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the site and

surrounding area. Consequently, for this reason the proposed development would be visually harmful.

6. The development does not fall within a conservation area and the property is not a designated heritage asset. The proposal would make effective use of land and optimal use of the potential of the site by creating additional accommodation within the roof space. Whilst these may be merits of the scheme they do not outweigh my above concerns or justify the proposed development.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Plan, Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan and the provisions of the Framework. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to be of a high quality standard of design and to be complementary to the surrounding area contributing positively to the street scene.
8. Three examples have been put forward suggested to be precedent cases that have been approved by the local planning authority. A non-material amendment allowed for a hip to gable extension and rear dormer at 24 Selborne Avenue, Bexley DA5 3LE in April this year. This followed a planning permission that granted a hip to gable roof extension, amongst other alterations, to this property in September last year. In March 2022 the local planning authority granted a lawful development certificate for alterations to the roofline incorporating a hip to gable extension with a rear dormer at 21 Arbuthnot Lane Bexley DA5 1EH. However, I am unaware of the full details of the circumstances relating to those cases such as to enable me to judge whether they are directly comparable to this case. Nonetheless, this development is a different proposal and therefore can and should be considered on its own merits.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR