

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

**by J E Tempest BA(Hons) MA PGDip PGCertHE MRTPI IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 22 August 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/W/17/3174210  
270-274 Broadway, Bexleyheath DA6 8BE**

- 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 Adam Martyn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
  - The application Ref 16/03204/FUL, dated 24 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2017.
  - The development proposed is second floor rear extension incorporating roof terrace to provide 2 x 1bed flats.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Adam Martyn against the Council of the London Borough of Bexley. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Preliminary Matter

3. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the Council's notice of decision and is the description given in the appellant's appeal form. This describes the proposal more concisely than the description on the original application form.

### Main Issues

4. These are the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the host building and on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

5. The appeal site forms part of a two storey terrace of predominantly commercial buildings fronting Broadway. The terrace includes various retail uses, cafes and restaurants and lies within a considerably more extensive area of commercial uses along Broadway. The Council suggests there are likely to be residential uses above the ground floor level in the terrace. Abbey Road runs to the west side of the terrace and although the appeal site is not directly adjacent to Abbey Road, the site is clearly visible in views from the southern end of Abbey Road. Immediately to the north of the terrace of which the appeal site forms part are two storey terraced residential properties fronting

Abbey Road. A narrow access lane runs along the back of the appeal site, between Abbey Road and West Street.

6. Nos 272 and 274 are combined into one property with restaurant use on the ground floor and offices above. Some time ago the building has been significantly extended and has a full width two storey and single storey flat roofed extension at the rear. The two storey element of this extension is some 12.5 metres in length and is at eaves height in relation to the pitched roof terrace. The single storey element extends a further 7.5 metres. This contrasts with the adjoining property to the west which appears to retain a historic form of a shorter two storey rear wing with mono-pitched roof.
7. The proposal would add a further floor to the property by extending at roof level from just below the ridge of the building. The rear pitch of the existing roof would be removed and replaced with a flat roof extension which would continue to a total length of just over 10 metres from the ridge, beyond which the side walls of the proposed extension would continue at a lower height to provide the flats with walled external terraces. The proposal also involves extract ducting to No 270 Broadway.
8. The extension would not harm the appearance of the building in views from Broadway. However, the effect of the proposals would be to increase the height of the whole of the existing two storey rear extension, significantly increasing the bulk of this part of the building. Although the mass of the extended building would step down towards the rear of the site the scale of the proposed extension, given its length and height, would be excessive in relation to the existing building.
9. The development would appear unacceptably bulky and would be poorly related to the appearance of the terrace of which the appeal site forms part, particularly when seen in views from Abbey Road. The appellant draws attention to the appearance of the buildings on Abbey Road at the rear of 278 Broadway and behind which the development is proposed. However, these are predominantly single storey buildings and their signage is not significant in the context of the proposed extension. A variety of alterations and extensions have taken place at the rear of the terrace. Despite these changes, and from what I was able to observe, none are as large in scale or as visually prominent as the appeal proposals would be.
10. The proposals would harm the appearance of the terrace. This harm would be exacerbated by the loss of the pitched roof at the rear of the appeal building and its replacement with the length of flat roof proposed. Although a high level window would be inserted in each side wall of the extended second floor, this would do little to improve the unrelieved expanse of wall which would result from the proposals.
11. The planning history shows that planning permission was granted in 2012 for a scheme to extend the building to provide two flats. I am provided with plans of that scheme which show this also would result in loss of the rear roof slope, a flat roofed extension of similar height to the appeal proposal but of shorter length. I have taken this into account in my consideration of the appeal proposals. However, the added length entailed in the appeal proposal would result in the extension being significantly more visually intrusive and bulky.

12. I acknowledge that the proposals would result in more spacious accommodation for the proposed flats and would provide outdoor amenity space which was not part of the previously approved scheme. The provision of two additional units of residential accommodation and the standard of the accommodation weigh in favour of the proposal. I have also taken into account the Council's assessment that the previously approved scheme would fall short of the space standards within The London Plan<sup>1</sup>. However, all of these factors are not sufficient to outweigh the harm which the proposal would cause to the appearance of the host building and therefore to the character and appearance of the area.
13. The development would fail to comply with 'saved' Policy ENV39 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan adopted in 2004 which aims to protect and enhance the quality of the built environment and, amongst other measures, seeks to ensure all new developments are of a high standard of design. This should include being compatible with the character of the surrounding area and not adversely affecting the street scene by reasons of scale, massing, height and elevational treatment.
14. The proposal would conflict with Policy 3.5 of The London Plan 2016 to the extent that, in making planning decisions, the design of all new housing developments should enhance the quality of local places. The proposal would also conflict with Policy 7.4 of The London Plan which relates to local character and which, amongst other matters, requires development should have regard to the scale, proportion and mass of surrounding buildings.

## **Conclusions**

15. For the reasons given above and having taken into account all matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*J E Tempest*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Mayor of London: The London Plan – the Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations since 2011 March 2016