

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2017

by Megan Thomas Barrister-at-Law

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

Decision date: 29th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3174565
13 Fieldway, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1JP

- 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 Mike Fogden against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref.DC/17/00338/FULL6, dated 25 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a "loft conversion".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene and its effect on the living conditions of the occupants of no.14 Fieldway with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is situated on the cul-de-sac Fieldway in the Petts Wood area of Bromley. It is a two-storey detached dwelling with a two storey rear addition, and single storey front and side extensions. There is off-street parking at the front on a paved area. The cul-de-sac contains dwellings of mixed design. Some are semi-detached with a curved front façade detail. No.12A is located in one corner, stepped back from the street and has an irregular shape and roof profile. The appeal site is located next to it.
 4. The proposed development involves the raising of the roof ridge on no.13 by about 1.2m to provide habitable accommodation in the roofspace. A hip to gable extension to both flank elevations is proposed that would result in a barn hip style roof. The development would also include a rear dormer structure and three front roof lights in the front roof slope. The materials used would be in keeping with the existing property and finished in brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing in colour, texture and size. The face and cheeks of the proposed dormer structure would also have matching hung tile cladding.
-

5. The appellant indicates that he is not able to use permitted development rights owing to previous extensions but points out that the use of dormers and hip to gable extensions can be seen in the immediate area. I do not disagree with that. However, the proposed increase in roof height and change of roof profile would add considerable bulk to the host dwelling resulting in a top heavy and unbalanced appearance. The front elevation, which is of a modest size, in particular, would be dominated by the disproportionate roof size.
6. Whilst there are differences in the roof profiles of dwellings on the cul-de-sac, (nos 12A, 12 and 11 in particular) the proposed development would result in a dwelling which was noticeably higher than others in the cul-de-sac. Notwithstanding its comparatively secluded position on the cul-de-sac, I consider that the resulting dwelling would harm the character and appearance of the streetscene and be contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006) and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 and 2.

Living conditions at no.14

7. The Council considers that the addition of a gable roof projecting beyond the rear of no.14 Fieldway would increase the bulk and visual impact of the rear projection to the extent that it would cause a loss of outlook for the occupants of no.14. However, the aspect from the rear windows of no.14 would not change significantly. The predominant views from no.14 are into their own garden owing to the orientation of the dwelling. The proposed development would not cause them to feel an undue sense of enclosure owing to the separation distances between the proposed new development and no.14 and its garden.
8. On this issue, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of no.14 Fieldway by reason of loss of outlook or otherwise.

Conclusion

9. I have borne in mind the need there is to increase family accommodation in this property at the current time. However, even though I do not consider that the proposal would harm the residential amenities of the occupants of no.14 Fieldway, I do consider that the resulting harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene are sufficient to warrant refusal of planning permission.
10. Having taken into account all representations made, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas

INSPECTOR