



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2021

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3270168 20 Canterbury Avenue, Sidcup DA15 9AS

- 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 A Nkweini against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref 20/02656/FUL, dated 9 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a hip to gable roof extension, with dormer in rear roof slope and insertion of 2 rooflights in the front roof slope.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The updated National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on the 20 July 2021. I have referred to this where relevant.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end of terrace dwelling. It has been previously extended to the side and rear. Canterbury Avenue is characterised predominantly by semi-detached properties of a fairly uniform original design, though many have been extended. They generally have a central ridge with gable ends to the front and rear elevations. However, the main roof form is hipped though some side extensions incorporate flat roofs. This hipped roof form is also used at either end of the terrace within which the appeal site is located.
5. The proposal would result in the existing hipped roof end being extended into a gable end to provide more room within the roofspace. A large flat roofed dormer would then be added to the rear roofslope extending across the whole of the increased width created to enable an additional bedroom and bathroom to be provided at this level within the property.
6. The new gable end would be evident in the streetscene and whilst not unduly visually prominent, would nevertheless appear as an incongruous roof form within the street, the character of which is almost wholly dominated by hipped roofs with the occasional flat roof as noted above. Although a number of

- dwellings in the street have been extended to the side, the use of a hipped roof form maintains a spacing at roof level which the proposed gable end would fail to provide.
7. The additional bulk of roof would be exacerbated by the proposed rear dormer, the large side 'cheek' of which would also be visible within the street scene. This would detract further from the spacing between the properties and emphasise the unsympathetic roof form.
 8. The proposed dormer would be the full depth of the roof extending from the eaves to the ridge such that no part of the original roof would be visible. It would be a very large and bulky addition that would dominate the rear of the dwelling and fail to be a subservient addition, respectful of the form of the original dwelling. This would be at odds with the Council's Design and Development Control Guideline 2 (DCG2) which states that roof extensions should be set back from the main wall of the host dwelling to avoid creating the appearance of an extra storey.
 9. Therefore, I find that the proposed roof additions would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene. There would be conflict with Policy CS01 of the London Borough of Bexley Core Strategy (2012) and policies H9 and ENV39 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004) which seek high quality sustainable design, that maintains and improves the best elements of Bexley's suburban character by ensuring new development reflects or enhances the unique characteristics of the area and is compatible with the character of the surrounding area. For these reasons and those set out above, there would also be conflict with the Council's DCG2 which sets out detailed guidance for house extensions including that roof forms should generally follow the pattern of the main roof.
 10. The proposal would also fail to comply with the Framework, in particular paragraph 126 which states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and paragraph 130 which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.
 11. I saw on my site visit that there are existing rear roof additions to other properties near the appeal site. However, none were as large or dominating as that proposed at this appeal site.
 12. I note that the proposal would provide enhanced accommodation for the applicant's family, however, this benefit does not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusions

13. Overall, for the reasons set out, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR