



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3238956

30 Crystal Palace Park Road, London SE26 6UG

- 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 Skinner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/02248/FULL6, dated 22 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a Loft Conversion and First Floor Side Extension with internal alterations and Material Change (see Approved Application 15/00907/FULL).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Despite the description of development set out above, I consider the description found on the Appeal Form better reflects the scheme that is before me and that which the Council considered. The development proposed is therefore for 'Erection of a two storey side extension with double height front bay window (to the northern side of the building) a first floor side extension (to the rear southern side of the building), and alterations to the roof involving a change to its pitch and height, a replacement front dormer window and a new rear dormer window and 2 no. rooflights to each of the front and side roof slopes'. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is situated within a residential area formed of differing house types, which vary in their scale and appearance, including their roof form but the roof pitches have similarities. Within the immediate context, the site is within a short row of detached two-storey houses from 28 to 36 Crystal Palace Park Road. These properties are situated within large plots with space to either side and deep rear gardens.
5. The existing roof profile of the two-storey parts of the appeal property incorporates two separate hipped elements. The rear part projects from the house but is inset to either side and includes a lower eaves line. The roof

profile is therefore unassuming and complimentary to the scale and roof form of the other houses within the row. The house has been extended to either side and at the rear with single storey additions but these do not offend the property.

6. Taken together, these features make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. The proposed two-storey and first floor side extensions would add significantly to the size and scale of the appeal property but would not, in themselves, be harmful to the appearance of the row of detached houses within the street. Moreover, space would remain between the appeal property and those to either side and the altered front façade would duplicate the existing double height curved bay window. The proposal would also utilise a palette of materials similar to those used in the construction of other altered houses in the street.
8. Despite this, the proposal would alter the pitch and overall height of the roof of the appeal property. I appreciate that there is some variety to roof forms in the surrounding area, including flat and mansard roofs. Nonetheless, the pitch of the proposed roof would be considerably steeper than those of the other detached houses within the row of properties in the street. The application drawings and 3D visuals help to visualise the distortion and considerable bulk that would be added to the roof of the property. This would not be satisfactory in visual terms.
9. When viewed from the street, the proposal would appear as a disproportionate, dominant and incongruous addition, the detailed design and form of which would add notably to the overall scale, bulk and mass of the appeal property. In particular, from the south, the extended roof form would be visible over the roof of No 28 and through the gap between it and No 30. In particular, the roof of the first-floor extension would overlap the side roof slope of the crown roof, thereby adding to the complexity and incongruous appearance of the overall proposed roof.
10. The proposed dormer window to the rear would also add to the overall height and mass of the proposal and appear unduly dominant and imposing in relation to the house. Although the visibility of the rear dormer would be limited from the street, it would appear prominent in views from neighbouring properties and their gardens. Moreover, the dormer would extend notably from the top of the proposed crown roof onto the rear roof slope, close to the first-floor windows beneath and fill the majority of the roof slope. The resultant height and scale of the dormer and the size and verticality of its window openings would unbalance the rear façade of the house and have a top-heavy appearance that would relate uncomfortably with the floors beneath.
11. Whilst I recognise that the proposals should be considered in relation to the flatted developments in situ and those yet to be constructed¹ to the north and south of the site, and the large town houses to the opposite side of the street, the appeal property is more closely related to the form, scale and appearance of the houses at Nos 28 to 36. Nevertheless, I have taken these developments into account when assessing the existing character and appearance of the area. In doing so, due to their position to either end of the row of properties, they exercise only a limited influence on the immediate street scene surrounding the

¹ Planning Reference 18/01228/FULL1 (46 Crystal Palace Park Road).

appeal site. Their presence would not therefore outweigh the harm that I have identified in respect of the proposal.

12. The site is opposite the Crystal Palace Park Conservation Area (CA) and Grade II Registered Park and Garden. I have therefore had regard to the statutory duty in Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. However, given the proximity and physical relationship of the proposal with these designated assets, their settings will be preserved and the proposal will not detract from them. I note that the Council raised no objection in this regard either.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Hence, the proposal would not accord with Policy 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (Adopted January 2019), which requires all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, to be of a high standard of design. In particular, proposals should complement the scale, proportion and form of adjacent buildings and positively contribute to the existing street scene.

Other Matters

14. I note that the Council did not raise any concerns with regard to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and the additional accommodation is required to meet the appellants' needs. Nevertheless, taking the proposal on its individual merits, these matters would not outweigh its harmful visual effects.
15. I have been referred to a previous planning permission for the extension and alteration of the property², which also included approval for a two-storey extension to the side of the property and alterations to the roof. However, it is unclear whether that permission was implemented, as permission was subsequently granted retrospectively for single storey extensions to the side and rear³, as the works undertaken differed from those consented by the original approval. Given that it is unclear whether that development could theoretically take place, this could not be considered to be a 'fallback' position. Nonetheless, based on the details of those proposals that were before me as part of the appeal, it is clear that the roof form differs significantly from the current appeal scheme. This would not therefore amount to sufficient justification to allow the appeal, as I have adjudged that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR

² Planning Reference: 15/00907/FULL6, granted in May 2015.

³ Planning Reference: 16/05200/FULL6, granted in December 2016.