



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020 by Scott Britnell MSc FdA

Decision by Anne Jordan BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3241333

36 Mada Road, Orpington BR6 8HQ

- 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 Mrs Jo Slevin against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/03812/FULL6, dated 6 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is hip to barn-end gable roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer and front roof lights.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. The planning application was made by Mr and Mrs Slevin, whilst the appeal has been submitted by Mrs Jo Slevin. I have proceeded on the basis that Mrs Jo Slevin was an original applicant.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this matter is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling on the south west side of Mada Road within a residential area. The property benefits from a single storey element to the side that extends almost up to the neighbouring property. The proposal is for a hip to barn-end gable roof alteration with a rear dormer and roof lights to the front.

Host property

6. The host property is simply designed and well proportioned. It has a hipped roof form with steep roof slopes and a short ridge that runs from front to back. The proposal would introduce a much larger roof form in the form of barn-end

gables with the ridge running parallel to the front and rear elevations. I note that the height of the proposal would be no higher than the current ridge and matching materials are proposed. However, due to its design, massing and bulk the proposed roof alteration would be a visually dominant and disproportionate addition to the dwelling, imbuing it with a top-heavy appearance. It would be at odds with the more restrained appearance of the current roof form and would appear discordant and incongruous. Thus, the proposal would cause substantial harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

7. I note that the Council do not object to the rear dormer. However, as I consider the main roof alteration to be unacceptable, and the dormer cannot be erected without this, it is not a matter upon which the appeal turns.

Surrounding area

8. The proposal by virtue of its design, massing, bulk and incongruous appearance would be prominently visible in views into the site from the public highway. In these views it would be an uncharacteristic form of development within the streetscene, having regard to the form and appearance of the host property, which would harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. In reaching this conclusion, I am mindful that there is variation in the roof form of properties within Mada Road. However, I consider that the current roof form, through its simple design and proportions, contributes positively to this mix and that its replacement as proposed would significantly erode this contribution. I also observed other properties with barn-end gable style roofs within Mada Road, including opposite the appeal site. These relate to properties of a different design, scale and form to the appeal dwelling and so are not directly comparable. Consequently, I do not consider that the general variation in roof forms within Mada Road or the presence of other barn-end gable style roofs justify the unacceptable development proposed.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. There would be conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Local Development Framework Local Plan London Borough of Bromley Planning Division January 2019 (BLP). The proposal would fail to comply with the requirement, among other things, that the scale and form in respect of residential extensions should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant suggests that the absence of Policy 7.6 of the London Plan within the refusal reason indicates that the Council agree with the policy criteria. However, I have not been provided with a copy of this policy and do not consider that its absence within the refusal reason indicates a tacit acceptance that the proposal accords with it. In any case, the Council has provided clear reasons for refusal with reference to policies of the BLP. As such, I attach no weight to this matter in my consideration of the appeal. I also note the absence of any concerns regarding the effects of the proposal on residential amenity. However, this is a neutral factor which does not diminish the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Scott Britnell

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR