



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2019

by J M Tweddle BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3236001

32 Silverdale Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1NJ

- 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 & Mrs T Clark against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/01682/FULL6, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer extension and provision of two rooflights in the front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have adopted the description of development set out in the Council's decision notice and subsequently cited by the appellants in their appeal submission as I consider this to be a more concise description of the proposal which omits superfluous wording. I am satisfied that in doing so neither party is disadvantaged, and I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a residential property which forms one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings located on the south-eastern side of Silverdale Road and within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). The property comprises a hipped roof arrangement and stepped front elevation exhibiting a strong symmetrical relationship with its adjoining neighbour, No 34.
5. Silverdale Road is a residential street with a planned and cohesive character comprising predominantly semi-detached properties with full hipped roofs, notwithstanding the fact that some properties have had alterations and extensions to their roofs. The symmetry and rhythm of the houses along the road is a defining characteristic that provides a degree of uniformity which contributes significantly to the character and appearance of the street scene and this part of the Petts Wood ASRC.

6. The development would result in a hip to gable roof enlargement that incorporates a half-hip/barn end roof profile and a rear facing box dormer extending across the new roof slope. The hip to gable extension would result in an unacceptable unbalancing of the roof-scape that would erode the strong symmetrical emphasis that the pair of semi-detached properties display in the context of the street scene. The bulk and visual prominence of this alteration would result in a discordant feature that would neither respect nor complement the original character and symmetrical appearance of the host property and its neighbouring semi. This would depart from the uniformity and pleasing symmetrical rhythm of residential properties along the street and is therefore harmful to the street scene and the wider character and appearance of the Petts Wood ASRC.
7. The rear facing box dormer extension is designed to be proportionate to the roof slope, stepped down from the ridgeline and set in from the eaves and gable end. In itself, I do not consider this to be a harmful feature, particularly as it will not be appreciable from the street, but its implementation relies on the hip to gable roof extension which I have found to be harmful. It follows, therefore, that this element must then also be considered unacceptable.
8. In reaching my conclusion I acknowledge that there are a limited number of examples of hip to gable extensions on the street. However, the examples I have been referred to demonstrate the harmful interruption such features make to the street scene, diminishing their symmetrical appearance with their adjoining semi. Thus, they serve to illustrate quite clearly why further similar developments would be unwelcome. The small number of examples cited by the appellant do not set any sort of precedent, as the prevailing character of the street remains to be that of semi-detached pairs with full hipped roofs displaying a strong sense of symmetry and uniformity.
9. For all these reasons, I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to the aims of Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 which, amongst other things, seek to achieve a high standard of design that respects or complements the host dwelling, is compatible with the surrounding area and enhances and strengthens the special and distinctive qualities of the Petts Wood ASRC. As a consequence, the development would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design that is sympathetic to local character and adds to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

10. My attention has been drawn to several appeal decisions¹ relating to proposals for hip to gable extensions where the Inspector found these features to be acceptable in their respective street scenes. Whilst I do not have the full details of these other schemes before me, I can see that they relate to other parts of the Petts Wood ASRC. I cannot therefore be certain that they offer a direct comparison to the appeal proposal and its immediate context. I have instead considered the appeal on its own merits.

¹ APP/G5180/D/18/3207283, APP/G5180/D/18/3209384 & LPA Ref. 18/05053/FULL6

11. I appreciate the additional accommodation that would be provided for the appellants, the use of matching materials and the lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. There would also be no significant loss of separation to the site boundaries. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons I have set out, the appeal should be dismissed.

Jeff Tweddle

INSPECTOR