
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/19/3234307

91 Danson Road, Bexleyheath, Kent DA6 8HP

- 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 and Mrs Erhabor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 18/02402/FUL, dated 17 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion, with new barn ends + R-dormer window & 4 velux to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed roof alterations on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The area is residential in nature and the appeal property sits within a run of predominantly detached houses which front towards Danson Road.
4. House types and roof designs are relatively mixed with properties variously incorporating hipped, gabled, flat and crown roofs. Modest dormer windows also feature.
5. The Design and Development Control Guidelines ¹ (DDCG) provide detailed design guidance on roof extensions at section 2.3.1. This indicates that all roof extensions should be set back from the main wall of the dwelling on which they are proposed to avoid creating the appearance of an extra storey. Saved Policy H9 of the Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan (BCUDP) (2004) states that residential development should not result in overdevelopment in terms of scale and mass.
6. The proposal includes the addition of a large rear dormer window which would cover the majority of the rear roof-slope. Although matching materials are proposed, through its large size and significant bulk and mass it would form a visually discordant and dominant feature on the rear roof-slope. The set back from the eaves would be minimal and it would therefore appear as an extra storey which the guidelines seek to avoid. Whilst its public visibility would be

¹ Bexley Council Unitary Development Plan Design and Development Control Guidelines (2004)

very limited from both Danson Road and Brasted Close it would have visibility from adjoining gardens and from properties to the rear. Subsequently, it would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

7. The Council are also concerned with regards to the other roof alterations proposed which include the introduction of a half hip half gable feature at each end of the roof-slope.
8. Guidance within the DDCG at 2.2.8 to my mind relates specifically to the type of roof that should be incorporated onto a house extension and therefore has more limited relevance to this scheme which relates solely to a roof extension.
9. Of more relevance is the DDCG at 2.3.1 which provides specific guidance in relation to roof extensions. The other roof alterations within the proposal would not exceed the highest ridge height of the existing dwelling and would not be of a design or massing which would be detrimental to the form of the existing roof. This is because the existing roof form lacks cohesion by reason of its alternate pitched and flat roof design. The other roof alterations would be appropriate to the wider character of the area given the variety of roof forms that exist.
10. However, for the reasons identified above, the rear dormer would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. The appeal proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies H9 and ENV39 of the BCUDP which require that development be appropriate to the character of the host building and wider area and guidance within the DDCG relating to roof extensions.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a roof and loft extension at 89 Danson Road in support of the scheme, however this is of a very different design and does not provide justification for the appeal. The appeal proposal would not have any adverse effect on the living conditions of existing residents. This is however a neutral factor.
12. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the Framework) in support of the appeal. However, the parts of the Framework referred to appear, largely, to relate to a previous version. In any event, section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

TJ Burnham

INSPECTOR