

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3154762

13 Elmstead Glade, Chislehurst, Kent, BR7 5DX

- 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 Sean Goodman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/01402/FULL6, dated 22 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Alterations to existing roof. Formation of rear dormer. Conversion of roof area to habitable use*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has not raised objections to the proposal in terms of it adversely affecting the living conditions or amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and I agree with this approach. As such, the main issue in this appeal is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and also the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a good sized two-storey detached dwelling with modest ground floor additions to both its flank walls. The proposal would involve altering the dwelling's roof hips to gable-ends, raising the ridge height by some 0.3m and erecting a rear dormer extension which would virtually cover the entire rear roofplane. Elmstead Glade shows a variety of residential houses, differing in design and roof form. Given this, and the distance between No 13's flank walls and those of both neighbouring dwellings, I find no objection to the raised ridge-line element of the proposal.
 4. Policy H8 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) requires, in relation to residential extensions, that their scale and form should respect or complement the host dwelling and, more specifically, that dormer windows should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape. The theme is amplified by the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance document No 2 'Residential Design Guidance' (SPG2) which advises that large or dominant dormers should be avoided and, when drawing up a design, particular care
-

should be taken to retain the architectural integrity of the dwellinghouse. I find this document more directly relevant to the proposal than SPG1 which is concerned with more general design principles.

5. In this particular instance the substantial rear dormer extension would effectively appear as an imposing third storey, flush with the dwelling's rear elevation below. Its design shows no subordination, which is an important feature of residential extensions and, by reason of its size, the development would fail to respect the composition of the existing dwelling. Indeed, far from respecting the form and appearance of the roofscape, it would overwhelm the roofplane.
6. The architectural integrity of the dwelling, having been ignored, would be damaged and whether or not the development could be readily seen by neighbouring occupiers somewhat misses the point. Given, though, that the flank walls of the dwelling can be viewed from certain points along Elmstead Glade glimpses of the dormer from the street would be likely due to its substantial depth.
7. The appellant attempts to draw a parallel with a similar development at No 6 Elmstead Glade, apparently recently granted planning permission by the Council. I have had regard to such, but the appellant has not provided me with any plans or details of this approved development. That said, each proposal has its own particular factors and circumstances and the fact that the Council may have taken a different view in the case of No 6 does not outweigh the harm that I have identified would result from the proposed development.
8. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and also the surrounding area, and this would materially conflict with the aims and requirements of UDP Policies H8 and BE1 and advice within the Council's SPG2.
9. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR