

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2017

by R J Maile BSc FRICS

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

Decision date: 23 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3177355

28 Courtlands Avenue, Bromley, Kent, BR2 7HZ.

- 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 and Mrs Christopher Hinton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref: DC/17/00781/FULL6, dated 20 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is: "2 storey side extension, single storey rear extension, loft conversion with rear dormer, attached garage/store."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the impact of the alterations and extensions upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 28 Courtlands Avenue is a semi-detached, inter-war dwelling located within an area of similar houses, many of which have been the subject of alterations and extensions over the years. They include a hip to gable roof extension at no. 30 (the other half of this pair of dwellings) and flank and rear dormers to no. 26.
4. Other dormer additions were noted during my site visit, including those at 22 Courtlands Avenue and at 9 Hilldown Road. Some of these, however, may well pre-date national policy in the Framework¹ and adoption of the Council's Development Plan policies.
5. I see no objection to the single storey extension, which projects rearwards by some 3.5m with a monopitch roof. Likewise, the hip to gable alterations would restore the symmetry with the adjacent property (no. 30). I am also satisfied, having regard to its high quality design and modest proportions, that the side

¹ The National Planning Policy Framework.

extension would be acceptable. It would retain a 1m gap to the boundary with no. 26 at first floor level, as required by "saved" Policy H9 (i) of the UDP².

6. The design of the side extension would retain the characteristic corner window to the smaller front bedroom, whilst the relocated garage to align with the front elevation is a typical feature of nearby dwellings. A similar scheme has recently been permitted at 5 Hilldown Road (ref: DC/16/00672/FULL6) retaining a 1m gap at first floor level above the garage, whose flank wall immediately abuts the boundary with the adjoining property. That development was noted as part of my site visit.
7. Notwithstanding my comments above, I am concerned that the rear box dormer is unnecessarily bulky. The new structure, which would span virtually the whole width of the extended rear roof slope, would overwhelm the rear elevation of no. 28 and would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature when viewed from the gardens of adjoining dwellings and the rear-facing windows of houses in Hilldown Road.
8. For these reasons I find upon the main issue that development as proposed would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area contrary to national policy at Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework and "saved" Policies BE1 and H8 (iii) of the UDP.

Conclusion

9. Several of the elements of the scheme before me are well designed and would be in keeping with the form and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area as required by national policy in the Framework, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan and "saved" Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the UDP.
10. Nevertheless, my concerns as to the impact of the large box dormer upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area are paramount.
11. Accordingly, and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

² The London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan: July 2006.