

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2019

by Ian Harrison BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3231684
16 Oakfield Gardens, Beckenham BR3 3AZ

- 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 Mark Abbott against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/01446/FUL6, dated 27 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2019.
 - The development proposed has been described as a loft conversion with a rear dormer gable up and front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with a rear dormer gable up and front roof lights at 16 Oakfield Gardens, Beckenham BR3 3AZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/01446/FUL6, dated 27 March 2019, 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: Location Plan at 1:1250 Scale, Block Plan at 1:500 Scale, SS10029 (Existing Floor Plans, Section and Elevations) and SS10029 Rev 2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development used above has been taken from the planning application form. The council used a different description but in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application in the heading above.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site is located within a cul-de-sac of residential dwellings. The dwellings include a mixture of terraced, semi-detached and detached dwellings, but most

are of consistent height and there are a number of common architectural features including timber detailing of the elevations and a limited range of materials. Several properties have been the subject of extensions to the side of the dwellings, including alterations to the roofs of the dwellings. The dwelling at the appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling that is generally consistent with its surroundings. Due to its position relative to the green space at the end of the cul-de-sac, it is possible to achieve views of the side and rear of the dwelling which makes this dwelling more prominent than most.

5. The proposal would see the alteration of the hipped roof at the side of the dwelling to form a full gable end. A large dormer with a Juliet balcony would be added to the rear. These alterations would be clearly visible from the public domain due to the positioning of the dwelling that is described above.
6. Several of the dwellings within the immediately locality have been extended and altered to the side and rear, with several having been the subject of roof extensions which has seen hipped gables replaced with gable ends. The Council has suggested that most alterations have occurred to terraced dwellings rather than detached dwellings, but it is apparent that various dwellings have been altered with no particular pattern or consistency to the type of dwelling or the means of extending those dwellings. The number and variety of alterations that have occurred has resulted in the reduction of the architectural consistency within the street. In this context it is considered that the extension of the roof of the dwelling to see the hipped gable replaced with a full gable would not be at odds with the character and appearance of the dwellings within the surrounding area.
7. The unbalancing of pairs of semi-detached dwellings is widespread throughout the street and as such, notwithstanding the concerns of the Council in this regard, I do not agree that causing the pair of dwellings to be inconsistent in appearance would cause material harm to the character or appearance of the dwellings or the locality.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development is therefore in accordance with policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (January 2019) which requires, amongst other things, that development is of a high standard of design and layout, that the scale, form and materials of extensions complement the host dwelling and are compatible with the surrounding area and that dormer windows are of a size and design that is appropriate to the roofscape.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions set out above. I have attached a condition to require the development to be undertaken in accordance with the submitted plans in the interests of clarity. Another condition requires the development to be undertaken utilising materials that match the existing dwelling in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Ian Harrison

INSPECTOR