



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2017

by Beverley Doward BSc BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3179796
13 Hillcrest Road, Biggin Hill, TN16 3UA

- 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 Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01781/FULL6, dated 19 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is raising of existing roof line with barn ends and new rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and on the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two storey dwelling with a garage underneath. It is sited in a residential area which, within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, comprises a mix of dwelling types, styles and ages. The appeal property (No 13) currently has a pitched roof and tall gable ends. It is an imposing dwelling within the street scene and exceeds the heights of the neighbouring dwellings on both sides. To the south is a modest bungalow which is one of a row of similar bungalows whilst to the north is a two storey dwelling with a shallow pitched roof, the ridge line of the roof of this property being significantly lower than that of the appeal property.
4. The proposed development would create a second floor level of accommodation within the roof space by increasing the ridge height of the roof by 1m and incorporating a rear dormer with 2 x Juliet balconies and front rooflights.
5. I appreciate that the half eaves/barn ends to the gables have been proposed in an attempt to lessen the impact of the raised ridge line and to reduce the extent of the increase of brickwork necessary on the gable ends. However, the proposal would, by adding further height and bulk to the dwelling, exacerbate the existing somewhat uncomfortable visual relationship between the appeal property and its neighbours. This would be particularly evident when viewed from both the south and north along Hillcrest Road. Furthermore, whilst the cheeks of the rear dormer have been set in from the gable ends on both sides

by 1650mm it would nevertheless be highly visible when viewed from the south of Hillcrest Road.

6. Accordingly, taken together, the proposed development by virtue of its overall design, bulk and height would appear prominent and incongruous to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the street scene. This would be contrary to policy BE1 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) which indicates that development proposals should be of a high standard of design which, amongst other things, complement the scale of adjacent buildings and do not detract from the existing street scene. It would fail to accord with policy H8 of the UDP which indicates that, amongst other things, the enlargement of residential properties should respect or complement the scale and form of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area and that dormer windows should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape. It would also fail to comply with the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and take account of the character of different areas.
7. The appellant indicates that the proposal would provide much needed additional bedroom space for this family dwelling. However, the appellant's individual rights must be weighed against other factors including the wider public interest. I have found above that the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and of the street scene and I am satisfied that the legitimate aim of granting planning permission in accordance with the development plan and planning policies which require buildings not to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area can only be adequately safeguarded by the refusal of permission. I consider that the dismissal of the appeal would not have a disproportionate effect on the appellant or the appellant's family.
8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Doward

INSPECTOR