



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2021

**by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 28 September 2021.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3276018**

**91 Danson Road, Bexleyheath 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 & Mrs Charles Erhabor against the decision of The London Borough of Bexley Council.
  - The application Ref 21/00516/FUL, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 20<sup>th</sup> May 2021.
  - The development proposed is alterations to roof line incorporating formation of rooms in roof space with a rear dormer extension and four roof light windows to front roof slope
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2 storey house with a pyramidal crown roof form, located on Danson Road opposite Danson Park. This part of Danson Road is parallel to but set back from the main Danson Road. The immediate local area is made up of similarly scaled detached houses with front gardens with off street parking, many of which appear to have undergone significant alteration with extensions.
4. The proposal would add significantly to the scale of the existing house by adding additional bulk at roof level through the extension of the existing crown roof across the full width of the property and by extending the flank walls upwards, thereby reducing the extent of the side pitches and somewhat squaring off the Crown roof form when viewed from the front and rear.
5. Three roof lights would be incorporated into the front roof slope and a rear dormer with Juliet balcony would be inset into the rear roof pitch that would extend across the full width and height of the flat part of the crown roof. This dormer element would add significant additional bulk at roof level, over and above that of the extended crown roof, which would only be visible from the rear of the property.

6. Although the additional bulk proposed at roof level would not result in an increase in the terminal height of the appeal property, it would, through its excessive bulk and generally squared crown roof, create a poorly massed roof form. This would result in the appeal property appearing top heavy and box like, even with its somewhat shortened side pitched elements of the crown roof.
7. In views from both the main and set back parts of Danson Road the excessive bulk and poor massing of the proposal extension would result in it failing to appear as a subordinate addition to the appeal property. Although the proposed dormer element would only be visible from the rear it would dominate the extended rear roof form, despite it being inset from the rear wall of the house. From the rear, this would result in the proposal appearing as an additional floor to the appeal property.
8. Overall, the proposal would appear as an excessive and dominating additional amount of bulk at roof level, the poor massing of which would result in this being incongruous in relation to the design and form of the appeal property. This would not be in keeping with the appearance, scale and design of the existing house, and that of neighbouring similar residential properties and the character and appearance of the local area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a previously dismissed appeal for a similar roof extension. However, only limited, and selected information from this appeal has been provided to me. Whilst I accept that the appellant has sought to respond to comments made in this earlier appeal, this appears to be limited to the degree to which the proposed dormer would be inset into the proposed extended Crown roof. This would match the extent of the inset of an unimplemented but previously approved and significantly smaller rear dormer extension<sup>1</sup>. Just as the previous appeal and planning application would have been considered on their own merits, I have done likewise with my considerations, and have only afforded this limited weight.
10. For the reasons given above I find that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area. This would be contrary to Policy CS01 of the Bexley Core Strategy (2012), saved Policies H9 and ENV39 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which collectively seek to ensure that development is compatible with the character and appearance of the existing building and local area, including through the scale and mass of extensions.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given the appeal is dismissed.

*Victor Callister*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Ref: 18/00098/FUL