
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2019 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3227505

5 Glebe House Drive, Bromley, Kent BR2 7BN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Trimmings against the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/18/04987/FULL6, is dated 12 March 2019 was refused by notice dated 8 April 2019.
 - The development was originally described as the removal of front dormer from front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The appellant's agent confirmed via email on 9 July 2019 that the correct description of the development is 'part retrospective gable end roof and side dormer'. This is consistent with the description used by the Council on the decision notice and appears to be a more accurate description compared to that originally used on the application form. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
4. Also, although the Council refers to a rear dormer within the Officer Report, this is not included in their formal decision and so this does not form part of my considerations for this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property forms the right hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses. The architectural features to benefit this property, and surrounding properties, are bow windows to the ground and first floor levels with a distinctive wide gable end roof to the front that incorporates a

chequered timber design; all of which provide for a very appealing view from the street. The appeal property, and neighbouring property at No.3, differs slightly from the vast majority of the houses along Glebe House Drive in that it benefits from a two storey side wing set back from the front elevation. At No. 3 this wing is topped with a hipped roof which reflects the side facing slope of the main roof, and it is assumed that prior to the side gable and dormer being constructed at the appeal site, the side wing at the appeal site would also have been hipped. The majority of surrounding properties have kept their original roof form of front gables and side slopes which provides a sense of uniformity and spaciousness between dwellings along Glebe House Drive and the neighbouring street, Hayes Wood Avenue.

7. The development fails to respect the design and massing of the original dwelling by reason of its significant bulk and considerable deviation from the original characteristic roofscape. It disrupts the uniformity of the street scene and the sense of spaciousness between buildings. Furthermore, it unbalances the semi-detached pair of houses it is a part of. Overall it detracts from the character and appearance of the area.
8. Although the appellant states the neighbouring property at 3 Glebe House Drive benefits from planning permission (ref 18/02884/FULL6) which would disrupt the symmetry between the two properties, this extension had not been commenced at the time of my site visit, and therefore I can give this consideration little weight. In any event, from the plans provided, that extension would retain a hipped roof design to its side elevation.
9. The appellant draws attention to other roof extensions nearby to the appeal site, including at the neighbouring property at No 7 and at No 20 opposite. These however only represent a small proportion within the local context and, in addition, those specific dwellings do not have side wings so the side dormer extensions there are not comparable to that before me.
10. For these reasons, therefore, the development conflicts with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (January 2019) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which seek to ensure developments complement the host dwelling, are compatible with the surrounding area and positively contribute to the existing street scene.

Recommendation and Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR