
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2017

by Caroline Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3180782
70 Albermarle Road, Beckenham BR3 5HR

- 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 Joel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01462/FULL6, dated 29 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as: loft conversion with 2 rear dormers, hip to gable conversion to both sides and front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for roof alterations to incorporate partial hip to gable extensions, front and rear dormers and rooflights at 70 Albermarle Road, Beckenham BR3 5HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/17/01462/FULL6, dated 29 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Plans Proposed (PLN05), 2nd Floor Plan Proposed (PLN06), Roof Plan Proposed (PLN07), Elevations Proposed (PLN08) and Section A-A Proposed (PLN09).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development in the decision above from that used on the Council's decision notice and by the appellant on the appeal form. I am satisfied that it is a more precise description of development that better reflects the proposal before me than that used on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 70 Albermarle Road is a large detached property within a generous plot, set well back from the road behind a large driveway. Vegetation along the front common boundaries screens longer range views of the property from either direction on Albermarle Road. The property is one of three of a similar style, constructed in brick with mock tudor detailing and a hipped roof. The surrounding area comprises a wide variety of dwelling types, sizes and designs, with numerous properties having been extended or altered to the front, including dormers.
5. In their Officer Report, the Council state they have no objections to the rear dormers, hip to gable conversion and rooflights. Having regard to the information before me and from my observations on site I have no reason to disagree.
6. The front dormer would sit between two existing projecting front gables. It would have a double height window with mock tudor detailing to match the existing. Whilst the dormer would be taller than the front gables, it would be narrower in width and recessed behind their facing walls. The dormer would be well set in from the side of the main roof and set down from the ridge. In light of the above, the dormer would not be an incongruous addition and would not dominate the roofscape. I consequently find that the addition of the front dormer would not cause any harm to the street scene.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area and find no conflict with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006) which seek to ensure, amongst other things, a high standard of design including development that does not detract from the existing street scene, development that should be attractive to look at and dormer windows which should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches, unless dormers are a feature of the area.

Conditions

8. I have imposed those conditions suggested by the Council. That relating to the approved plans is necessary in order to provide certainty and that relating to materials is necessary in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Caroline Jones

INSPECTOR