

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2016

by Timothy C King (BA Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3156104

20 Burford Road, Bromley, BR1 2EZ

- 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 Steve Mountain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02536/FULL6, dated 25 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a '*Front and rear mansard roof extension with velux roof lights.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front and rear mansard roof extension with velux roof lights at 20 Burford Road, Bromley, BR1 2EZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/16/02536/FULL6, dated 25 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No BUR20/1 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey detached dwelling, with a prominent front gable, and a flank gabled-end. From my observations, in walking along Burford Road following my site visit, it would be hard to find a more diverse residential street in terms of its properties' age, form, and character. Taking the street as a whole there are examples of Edwardian dwellings, inter-war and post-war houses and also recent new-builds. Many have also been altered and modified. This makes for a wide variety of designs, heights and roof forms.
-

4. The stretch of road accommodating the properties Nos 14-24, within which the appeal dwelling sits centrally, is a case in point where only Nos 16 and 18 have common features, being a pair of semi-detached dwellings. Also, directly on the opposite side of the street are a series of bungalows which themselves have little uniformity in style, showing a variety of roof arrangements.
5. The proposal would involve outwardly projecting the front and rear roofslopes in the form of a mansard arrangement. Save, therefore, for the gable fronted central ridge, the dwelling's roof would be altered to that of a table-top form. The Council, in its case report, comments that this would give the impression of a third storey, and I acknowledge that roof extensions to front slopes can often appear unduly bulky. However, in this case, at both the front and rear, the projected roof planes would be significantly set in from the forward gable, which would remain as the dwelling's predominant feature. In this regard I consider that the additional bulk would be tempered.
6. As regards proposed physical alterations to buildings Policy BE1 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP) requires that development should not detract from the existing streetscene, scale, form and layout of adjacent buildings. The theme of compatibility is also reflected in Policy H8 thereto which, specifically relating to householder extensions, indicates that the scale and form of the development should respect or complement both the host dwelling and its surroundings. In this particular instance I consider that the form of the proposed roof extensions, whilst inconsistent with the host dwelling's definite building lines, would not unduly detract from its appearance. Neither would it cause detriment to the much varied streetscene.
7. The proposal would involve the inclusion of velux windows or rooflights in the front and rear roofslopes, and certain interested parties have raised concerns as to possible overlooking. The windows are shown flush with the new roofslope and, under householder permitted development entitlement, their installation would not necessarily require planning permission. Besides, due to their proposed positioning in the rear slope and the distances involved I do not consider that any loss of privacy to surrounding occupiers would arise. Similarly, the siting of a rooflight proposed in the gable's flank would not unduly impact on the privacies of No 22 Burford Road.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor its surrounding area, and there would be no material conflict with UDP Policies BE1 and H8.
9. For the above reasons, and having taken into account all matters raised, the appeal succeeds. In terms of conditions, apart from the statutory time limit, in the interests of certainty I impose a condition requiring that the development be implemented in accordance with the approved plans. A condition is also included requiring the use of materials to match those of the existing dwelling.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR