



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3241660

78 Hayes Street, Hayes, Bromley, BR2 7LH

- 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 Sue Forrest against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/03416/FULL6, dated 6 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2019.
 - The development is a proposed 1st floor side extension over garage and conversion of garage into habitable room.
-

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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the western side of Hayes Street. It forms part of a row of four semi-detached dwellings that feature front mansard dormers and side garages with half-pitched roofs, some of which have been converted to habitable space. This row of houses is defined by its consistent building line set behind landscaped front gardens, the gaps between the dwellings, and the distinctive front mansard dormers. These features give a strong rhythm to the built form along this part of the road.
 5. The surrounding area is mixed in character with a parade of high street shops to the north and a mostly residential area to the west. The appeal site lies directly adjacent to the Hayes Village Conservation Area (HVCA) which encompasses an open verdant area to the east occupied by the grounds of the St Mary The Virgin Church, the Hayes Old Rectory Gardens and the Hayes library.
-

6. The proposal would result in a two-storey side extension and the conversion of the existing side garage. The extension would feature a first-floor side pitched roof that would sit below the main roof and a projecting front mansard dormer that would match the existing front mansard roof. The incorporation of a mansard roof design would harmonise with the existing dwelling however the extension would appear dominant and bulky in light of its height and forward projection at first floor level. The half-depth of the extension along the flank elevation would appear odd when viewed from the street and would thus constitute poor design. In my view, the proposal would disrupt the rhythm of the built form and would appear incongruous in the street scene.
7. Although the appellant states that the development would replicate other extensions at 74 & 72 & 70 & 68 Hayes Street, the resultant dwelling would differ from these in that the mansard slope would not extend across the full width of the frontage but would be interrupted by the recessed front entrance area. Also, none of the other dwellings in the row have two-storey side extensions above what used to be the original side garage. I acknowledge that no. 68 has a hip to gable loft extension and a converted side garage that is level with the existing front bay however the single storey height of the side projection has been maintained. I therefore find that no.68 is not directly comparable to the proposal put before me and does not alter my view that the proposed additional bulk at first floor level would not tie in with the existing dwelling and row of properties.
8. Paragraph 190 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that development affecting the setting of a heritage asset may affect its significance. The appeal site is within the setting of the HVCA. There is limited evidence before me regarding its significance, but from my observations on site, it is largely derived from large historic buildings and their relationship to open verdant grounds. The surrounding small domestic dwellings therefore make a very limited contribution to the significance. Due to the limited visibility of the development in the wider context of the HVCA owing to the substantial landscaping, it would not harm its character or appearance or its significance.
9. Notwithstanding the lack of harm to the HVCA, the proposal would appear as a discordant addition to the host dwelling, would disturb the architectural consistency of the row of properties it forms part and thus have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the immediate area.
10. For the reasons above I conclude that the development therefore conflicts with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) which aim to ensure new development and residential extensions are well designed and respectful of their contexts.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

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.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR