
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 06 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3271487

49 Hayes Chase, West Wickham, Bromley BR4 0HX

- 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 Caroline Lambert against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/05154/FULL6, dated 9 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations with rear dormer and 2 front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this detached 2 storey house which is located within a residential area of similar houses. The houses appear to date from the inter-war period and it is notable that the vast majority have hipped roofs. Many of the houses have been extended and I saw all of those referred to by the appellant at my site visit, including those with side gabled roofs.
4. Notwithstanding the fact that many forms of extensions have been undertaken to the houses within this road, the great majority have retained hipped roofs at the sides. This helps to retain a degree of space between the properties, particularly at the upper level, even where adjacent houses have been extended. In addition, it is a consistent feature which unifies the appearance of the properties and is characteristic of the area. The appeal property currently contributes positively to this characteristic with its series of hipped roofs.
5. The proposal would include the formation of gables at both sides of the property, where hipped roofs currently exist. The property would retain some of the other existing hipped elements, including one to the left-hand side, to the rear of the proposal. When seen in combination with the unaltered existing parts of the roof, I consider that the proposed gables would clash visually and would appear at odds with the remainder of the roof. When seen in its wider

context, the proposal would appear out of character with the great majority of houses which have various forms of hipped roofs.

6. In relation to those few properties which have some gabled elements, the Council has indicated that some have arisen from extensions undertaken as permitted development and so will not have been the result of planning permission issued by the Council. In relation to others, I have not been provided with any details of whether these have received permission from the Council. In any event, they form only a small number within the road and in my judgement run contrary to the prevailing character. Furthermore, they serve to demonstrate the disruptive effects of such extensions.
7. I have also taken account of the other forms of extensions within the area. Whilst there are many in number and form, I consider that none would justify allowing the proposed extension. Due to its design and appearance, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the area, contrary to Policies 6 and 37 of the Council's Local Plan 2019. Taking account of all other matters, there is nothing of sufficient weight to outweigh that harm. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR