



---

## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 December 2021 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

**Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3281235**

**328 Southborough Lane, Bromley BR2 8AA**

- 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 Anuj Mangal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
  - The application Ref DC/21/01303/FULL6, dated 16 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2021.
  - The development proposed on the application from is: Hip-to-gable roof extension incorporating side flat roof dormer windows, front and rear gable end windows.
- 

### 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 the surrounding area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 328 is a detached two storey dwelling located in a residential area which contains a mix of dwellings including semi-detached and bungalows. There is a range of differently designed houses with the majority having some form of gable feature facing the road with a few examples where there are first-floor extensions which face sideways.
5. No. 328 has a traditional hipped roof with its hipped gable end facing the road and a smaller secondary hipped roof over a two storey bay window which sits forward of the main roof. The proposal seeks to change the existing hipped roof to form a gable roof with dormers at either side with front and rear gable end windows.
6. The proposed development would increase the overall height and mass of the roof and irrevocably remove the traditional hipped roof. In combination with the hip to gable extension, the dormer windows would appear substantially and disproportionately large resulting in overly bulky and juxtaposed side additions which would not respect the design and proportions of the original dwelling and would fail to contribute positively to the existing street scene.

7. From street view, the proposal would, as a result of its excessive scale and form, appear incongruous, despite the proposed materials matching that of the existing. The harmful impact would not be mitigated by the presence of the adjacent street tree which would only partially screen views of the development.
8. Whilst I appreciate that there is a variety of different house types and roof profiles within the area, this variety appears as an integral part of the street scape. Although I did observe a number of modifications, including side facing dormers, on other properties within the surrounding area these do not appear as a predominate feature or form a significant part of the established character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, these typically appear on differently designed properties and do not set a precedent for the harm that would be caused, having regard to the specific design characteristics of the appeal property as described above, particularly the attractive contribution made by the hipped roof.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to the aims of Policies 6, and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 which, amongst other things, seek to achieve a high standard of design that respects or complements the host dwelling and is compatible with the surrounding area.

### **Other Matters**

10. The officer's assessment of the proposal states *that a significant loss of amenity with particular regard to light, outlook, prospect and privacy would not arise*. However, in their conclusion they state *it would result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents*. The reason for refusal makes no reference to the loss of amenity and it appears that this may be a typographical error. From what I saw on site, I am satisfied that the proposal would not impact on the neighbouring amenity and had the proposal been found to be acceptable, a condition to secure obscured glazing to the side windows could have been attached to protect existing and future occupiers from any perceived overlooking.

### **Conclusion**

11. The proposal conflicts with the most relevant policies in an up-to-date development plan. There are no material considerations which would warrant granting planning permission for the proposal which does not comply with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, 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