
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2016

by Jane Miles BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/16/3157308

2 Pembury Road, Bexleyheath, Kent DA7 5NB

- 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 Jashmair Jheeta against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application ref: 16/01217/FUL, dated 25 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extended roof to existing property'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. No. 2 is half of a hipped roofed semi-detached pair. It has a garage to the side with a first floor side extension above. A low pitched roof element to the front of the side extension screens the larger area of flat roof behind it in some views from the street. The appeal proposal would be a continuation of the existing hipped roof of the main building across the side extension, albeit set back slightly from the north-east end wall behind a very low parapet. As I understand it this is a revised scheme¹, omitting the roof lights and solar panels which featured in a previous scheme that was dismissed on appeal. However the Council officers' report on this current proposal indicates the height, mass and form of the great majority of the additional roof area would remain the same as in the scheme dismissed on appeal.
3. The **main issue** in this current appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the street scene.
4. No. 2 is in a prominent position close to the junction with Lenham Road, albeit the proposed additional roof would be seen primarily in the context of buildings in Pembury Road. This suburban residential street is characterised mainly by two-storey semi-detached pairs of varying designs. It is readily apparent that many have been altered and extended in various ways, including by the addition of two-storey side extensions with pitched roofs. As noted in the appellant's statement, in some of those instances existing roofs have been extended sideways, but without their ridge heights being reduced to achieve

¹ Described by the Council, in processing the application, as 'Alterations to roofline to provide hip roof over existing two storey side extension'

the subordinate effect advocated in the Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines (DDCG).

5. In particular the appellant refers to one such extension at no. 6 Pembury Road approved in 2010 when, as now, saved UDP² Policies H9 (Extensions and alterations) and ENV39 (Built environment) and the related DDCG were applicable. However not only do nos. 6 and 8 sit slightly further back from the street, but their basic design differs significantly from that of nos. 2 and 4. The main roof at nos. 6 and 8 is set back from prominent and tall front gable features, such that the extended roof and ridge line at no. 6 does not appear unduly dominant in the street scene.
6. In contrast, the design of nos. 2 and 4 includes a roof which projects out beyond the main front wall, supported on decorative brackets, creating a much more prominent feature in the street scene. Moreover this 'overhanging' roof design has been continued across no. 2's existing extension which is flush with the main front wall (rather than set back, as is the case at some other properties in the street). In these circumstances the bulk and height of the proposed additional roof would result in an unduly dominant and overbearing feature, detracting from the proportions of the existing semi-detached pair and from the character and appearance of the street scene. It would be all the more harmful due to the prominent position of no. 2, adjoining the rear garden space of the adjacent corner property in Lenham Road.
7. Of the various other examples of extensions where existing ridge lines have been extended (cited by the appellant) I saw none sufficient to alter my conclusion that, in its specific site context, the proposal for no. 2 would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and the street scene. Indeed the example of the pair at nos. 26 and 28 Pembury Road, where both roofs have been extended in a similar manner to that proposed for no. 2, serves to demonstrate the detrimental impact that has had on the proportions of the pair, to the detriment of the street scene's character and appearance.
8. I note the appellant's attempts to address the concerns of the Council and neighbouring occupiers. However neither these nor any other matters raised are sufficient to alter or outweigh my conclusion that the current appeal proposal would be harmful to, rather than compatible with, the character of the existing building and street scene. In this respect the proposal would conflict with the development plan, most notably saved UDP Policies H9 and ENV39 and also Policy CS01 (Achieving sustainable development) of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012). It follows therefore that the appeal must fail.

Jane Miles

INSPECTOR

² In full, the London Borough of Bexley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2004