
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3249366

4 Hassock Wood, Keston BR2 6HX

- 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 Richard Leahy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/04979/FULL6, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is two dormer windows to the front roof and two dormer windows to the rear roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals 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 in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling with an attached garage to the front, a single storey side extension and a conservatory to the rear. It is located within a residential setting comprised of other relatively large two-storey detached dwellings in an informal cul-de-sac layout. The proposed development would introduce two box dormer windows on the front elevation of the property and two on the rear elevation.
5. Although the proposed dormers, on both the front and back, would be set within the existing roof slope and set back from the eaves, they would be positioned high on the roof slopes, almost touching the ridge, and would cover a large proportion of the existing roof. As such they would appear as significant additions to the dwelling. Due to their substantial size on a relatively shallow roof, both sets of dormers would appear overly large and would create a dominant roofscape to the detriment of the host dwelling. This would be exacerbated by their flat-roof, box design. Although this may be the most

viable option and create the most usable space within the property, this does not justify its bulky design.

6. The dormers on the front elevation of the dwelling are located on a prominent roof pitch and would be highly visible from the public realm. Furthermore, it was noted during the site visit that no other examples of similar dormer windows are apparent within the surrounding area. This means the proposed dormers would be incongruous additions to the streetscene and would appear at odds with other surrounding properties. Their incongruity would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. The dormers to the rear would have limited visibility from the public realm and therefore would have no direct impact on the character and appearance of the area.
7. Policy 6 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019) states that dormer windows should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches, unless dormers are a feature of the area. As it has been identified that both sets of dormers would not be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and the front dormers would be located on a prominent roof pitch, the proposal would not be in accordance with the stipulations of this policy.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2016) and Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019). These policies collectively seek to ensure that new development is of a high-quality design and layout, which makes a positive contribution to a coherent public realm and the streetscene and that the scale and form respects or complements the host dwelling and is compatible with development in the surrounding area.

Other Matters

9. It is noted that both the Council and the appellant have stated that the proposed development would not result in a loss of light, outlook or privacy to the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However this lack of harm is a neutral factor and therefore would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area which has been identified.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR