



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/24/3344077

10A Rochester Close, Sidcup, Bexley DA15 9PG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Pablo Castelli against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 24/00772/FUL.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of proposed development from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. This cul-de-sac comprises mostly two storey semi-detached properties of which the appeal property is one. The semi-detached properties retain their hipped roof forms. The proposal would change the form of the roof of this semi-detached property from hip to gable. This would be an uncharacteristic roof feature within this street scene and would visually unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties. The proposed development would stand out as being an insensitive development within the street scene and consequently it would be detrimental to local character and the visual appearance of the area.
5. I have been referred to three recent Council planning permissions. The Council has advised that none of those developments highlighted by the appellant are within Rochester Close or within the environs of the appeal site and do not relate to proposals for hip to full gable roof extensions. Those developments therefore offer little support in favour of the proposal that is before me. On the individual considerations of this case I have found the development would be visually harmful.

6. The property is not within a conservation area or area of special character designation. Whilst these are merits of the proposed development, they do not outweigh my above concerns or justify the development. The harm that I have identified above would be clearly visible in the street scene and would be harmful to the appearance of the area.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy D1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan 2023 and the Design & Development Control Guidelines: Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). These policies seek, amongst other matters, all development within the borough to be of high-quality design and to complement the surrounding area contributing positively to the street scene. The SPD requires loft and roof space extensions not to be detrimental to the form of the existing roof by reason of design or massing.

Conclusion

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

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR