



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2025

by **Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/24/3351445

27 Pickford Road, Bexleyheath, DA7 4AG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr McNamara & Ms Daniels against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01291/FUL.
 - The development proposed is conversion of roof space involving alterations to existing roofline, including a hip to gable enlargement, a rear dormer extension, dormer windows to front, a rooflight to front roof slope and provision of a pitched roof to the rear with a Juliet balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect for the proposed roof and dormer extensions on the surrounding area and streetscene.

Reasons

3. The house is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling, with a tiled hipped roof. The property is within a residential area with a broad variety of house types including terraced housing and flatted development. Pickford Road has predominantly suburban two-storey detached and semi-detached properties, with both hipped and gabled roofs. The next house to the left of the appeal dwelling, No.29, is of 2-storeys and has a gabled roof, whilst to the right is a bungalow, with a half hip roof.
4. Whilst dormer extensions are not uncommon along Pickford Road, these are predominantly located to the side and rear, an example being at No.29 where a slightly complex arrangement has small dormers fitted in the junction of the main roof and a 2-storey gabled extension.
5. A recent approval (ref no. 23/03227/FUL) has been given for changing the existing hipped roof of the appeal property to a gable-ended roof, adding a gable roof to the existing flat roofed rear two-storey extension, with a Juliet balcony and side windows. That decision (the 2024 scheme) is dated 19 January 2024 and is therefore extant and establishes the principle of all the development in the appeal proposal except the rear dormer extension and the dormer windows to front. The proposed development would be seen from the public realm and the rear of neighbouring properties.

6. The Council's Design and Development Control Guidelines 2 (DDCG2) state that roof extensions, should not, by reason of design or massing, be detrimental to the existing roof. In this case, it is reasonable to take the permitted change from hip to gabled roof and gable roof over the existing 2-story flat roofed rear extension as a starting point.
7. The 2024 scheme allowed for a gabled roof, containing habitable floorspace lit by a door with Juliet balcony and rooflights. The appeal proposal is to place dormer windows each side of this gabled extension. These dormers would have a flat roofs which would project from just below the ridge of the main roof, and would rise vertically from the eaves of that roof. The dormers would extend each side almost to the verges of the main roof. Within the rear faces of this dormer would be windows on each side to the projecting gable.
8. The result of this proposal would be an unpleasant mix of roof forms that would greatly detract from the relatively simple roof forms as approved. This would be visible in the views of a number of private gardens, and also from the south on Pickford Road. The front dormers would also be detrimental to the appearance of the dwelling. Although they spring from well above the eaves of the front roof slope, the drawings show that the ridges run out from the top of the ridge of the main roof. Although DDCG2 only seeks to avoid dormers exceeding the ridge height of the existing building, the proposal is not visually satisfactory. The proportions of the proposed dormers and their size in relation to the main roof slope do not amount to good design.
9. I fully appreciate the appellants' desire to maximise the habitable floorspace, and that the additional area only amounts to 6m², but the public interest in achieving good design, as required by the development plan policies of the Bexley Local Plan (2023), particularly Policies SP5 and DP11, the DDCG2 guidelines, and the National Planning Policy Framework, outweighs the private interests. For the reasons that I have set out above, the proposal is contrary to the intentions of the policies referred to. Therefore the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR