The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2017

by P G Horridge BSc(Hons) DipTP FRICS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3165647
29 Walsingham Road, Orpington BR5 3BP

- 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 R Payton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
- The application Ref DC/16/04029/FULL6 was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion at the rear and ground floor extension for a porch and storage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. At issue is the effect of the extensions on the appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. 29 Walsingham Road is a two-storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof. The houses in this part of the street are all of the same design. The proposal involves increasing the roof accommodation by extending the hipped roof to form a gable and by adding a large box dormer in the rear roof slope, and building a single-storey pitched roof side extension.

4. Relevant planning policy is contained in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (adopted 2006). Policy BE1 requires all new development to adopt a high standard of design. Policy H8 deals specifically with residential extensions. Their scale and form should be compatible with the surrounding area, while dormer windows should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches.

5. There is no objection to the side extension. The transfiguration of the existing hipped roof to a gable would, however, unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached houses, creating a discordant feature in the streetscene. This would be exacerbated by the large and bulky appearance of the flat roof dormer at the rear, which would be disproportionate in relation to the roof in which it sits. While there are examples elsewhere in the street of extensions to hipped roofs (numbers 36 and 40 now have cropped gables and 17 has a side dormer), none are the same as what is proposed at number 29. In any event they serve to demonstrate the incongruity of one house of an originally matching pair having a different roof structure to its partner. That is also true

of the examples elsewhere in the borough cited by the appellant. Overall, the development would be a discordant feature detrimental to the appearance of the streetscene and contrary to UDP Policies BE1 and H8.

Peter Horridge

INSPECTOR