
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2020

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3240166
163 Framlingham Crescent, London SE9 4AJ

- 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 Lianghua Chen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/01574/FULL6, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is increase width of the approved rear dormer extension with the installation of an additional window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The planning application is retrospective as the development has already taken place. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect on the occupants of neighbouring properties with regards outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a 2 storey, extended end of terrace property within a triangular corner plot at the junction of Beaconsfield Road and Framlingham Crescent. The shape of the plot means the rear of the site is very narrow and is in close proximity to No. 247 Beaconsfield Road which has also been extended. The wider area is characterised by properties grouped in blocks of 6, set back from the pavement.
5. The dormer extends across the majority of the extended property and rises almost directly from the rear wall to the end of a flat roof just below the ridge. The dormer which extends beyond that which has planning permission significantly increases the overall bulk of the roof, creating a form of

development that is out of scale and proportion to the dwelling. It is therefore incompatible with the character of the host property.

6. Although the dormer is located on the rear of the property, it is clearly visible from Castlecombe Road in the gap between properties. It consequently creates an incongruous feature detrimental to the street scene.
7. The scheme harms the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflicts with Policy 6 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (Local Plan) which requires dormers to be of a scale and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches. It also conflicts with Policy 37 of the Local Plan which requires new development to be of a high standard of design and layout and positively contribute to the street scene.

Living Conditions

8. The dormer window is clearly visible from the rear of No. 247 and No. 249 Beaconsfield Road. The development appears prominent and visually intrusive when viewed from the rear of the properties, given their close proximity. This is exacerbated by the confined amenity space of the dwellings. The scheme consequently harms the outlook of the occupants of the neighbouring properties. It therefore conflicts with Policy 37 of the Local Plan which requires new development to respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has identified the presence of other dormers in neighbouring properties in support of their case. However, they differ from the scheme before me in terms of their bulk and massing as a result of being set back from the eaves and ridge line of their host roofs which reduces the impact. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my decision is based on the information before me.
10. I acknowledge the increased living space for the occupants that results from the development. However, this is outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR