



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/20/3258876

63A Ravensbourne Road, Bromley BR1 1HN

- 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 Neil Miller against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/01080/FULL1, dated 16 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a flat roofed rear dormer and attached flat roofed outrigger roof extension with front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

2. Since the date of the decision The London Plan 2021 (LP 2021) was published on 1 March 2021 and is now part of the development plan. The Council's decision notice referred to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 (LP 2016), which are now superseded. Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the LP 2021 are relevant replacements for LP 2016 Policies 7.4 and 7.6, insofar as they deal with delivering good design and for development proposals to respond positively to local distinctiveness.
3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the appeal dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a detached residential building on Ravensbourne Road. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of residential development ranging from large detached properties to more modern blocks of apartments. A number of buildings adjacent to the appeal site have been altered or extended over time.
5. I note that in 2017 consent was sought at appeal¹ for a similar scheme, the appellant details that the scheme under consideration here differs from that previously dismissed at appeal by avoiding an increasing roof height of the and reducing the width of rear dormer.
6. The rear of the appeal property overlooks an area of land which slopes down away from the property. As such, the appeal dwelling has a two-storey

¹ APP/G5180/W/17/3176873

appearance from the street and appears as a prominent three storey property from the rear, including from the adjacent public footpath. The rear elevation of the property, including a modest existing pitched roof outrigger, is viewed as a pleasant well-proportioned building.

7. The appeal scheme proposes the erection of a flat roofed extension on top of existing outrigger at the rear of the property. I note that similar extensions are present on nearby buildings, specifically those at Nos. 65 – 71 Ravensbourne Road. The appeal scheme does therefore have some consistency and coherence to the adjacent properties and is viewed in this context.
8. However, the submitted plans show that the proposed extension is unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing property and would thus appear as a disproportionate and unsensitive extension to the existing well-proportioned building in a prominent location. The presence of the extensions at Nos. 65 – 71 Ravensbourne Road referred to previously do not convince me as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would have a significant detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the appeal dwelling. It would therefore be contrary to Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan and Policies D1, D3 and D4 of the LP 2021. These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that new development is of high design quality, respects the scale and form of its host property and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of its surroundings.

Other matters

10. The appellant states that the proposed development has not attracted any objection from the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, the absence of objections does not necessarily indicate support or that the proposed development causes no harm.
11. I note that the Appellant has prepared a Personal Statement detailing the need for the proposed works to accommodate their family. While this is a material consideration that weights in favour of the proposal, it is primarily a private benefit and it does not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.

Conclusion

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

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR