
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 August 2021 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3274617

8 Ridgeway, Hayes, Bromley BR2 7DE

- 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 Nage & Ms Slater against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/04933/FULL6, dated 3 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is Roof alterations to facilitate loft conversion including rear dormer window, partial hip to gable extension and insertion of two roof windows to front roof slope.
-

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 effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the surrounding area.

Preliminary Matter

4. The Government published on 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration in my decision-making, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 8 is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with two storey side addition located in a residential area which contains a mix of detached and semi-detached properties. The pattern of development along Ridgeway is characterised by the prominent hipped roofs of the main dwellings with many of these having subordinate side additions featuring hipped roofs that, in the

- main, are set back and down from the original. This uniformity in design and appearance defines the character of the street.
6. The proposal seeks to incorporate a rear dormer window, partial hip to gable extension over the existing side extension and insertion of two roof windows at the front. The rear dormer and roof lights are considered acceptable by the Council and from what I saw at the time of my site visit I have no reason to disagree.
 7. The proposal would see the existing stepped ridge of the two-storey side addition rise up and align with the ridge of the original with a partial hipped end. This would, as a result of the proposal's design, scale and form significantly alter and diminish the appearance of the original hipped roof profile. Appearing as a juxtaposed and irregular addition when viewed in relation to the neighbouring property and in the wider street context.
 8. Furthermore, whilst I acknowledge the adjoining neighbour, No. 6, has replaced the original hipped roof with a pitched roof, given that this does not appear to exceed the width of the main dwelling and that it has a subordinate single storey side addition, the overall visual proportions of the original dwellings are retained. The proposal, however, would create a visual imbalance as a result of its excessive bulk as a result of the proposed ridge line which, when aligned with the original, would extend out across the majority of the existing two storey addition. The resulting proposal would neither respect or complement the existing character and appearance of the host property or the wider area.
 9. Whilst its use of materials are similar to the original, this factor alone does not override the significant harm that would arise as a result of the overly excessive roof mass, its style and the unbalanced appearance it would create to the existing pair of semi-detached properties.
 10. I acknowledge that the proposal would remove the existing flat roof extension at the rear of the property, however, this does not feature prominently in street views when taken from the front. In any event, I feel the harm that would be caused to the overall character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area, for the reasons discussed above, would far outweigh this purported benefit. I attach no weight to this argument.
 11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such it does not accord with the requirements of Policies 6 and 37 of the Local Plan, London Borough of Bromley Planning Division (2019), which seek to secure development that responds positively to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

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, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR