

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022 by A Humphries BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3297179

32 Bourne Vale, Hayes, Bromley, BR2 7JW

- 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 Greg Sodergren against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/05002/FULL6, dated 14 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including hip to gable, rear dormer and 2X skylight in the front slope of the roof.
-

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 main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The host dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached property within a residential area characterised by semi-detached dwellings. The architectural style and roofscape of the dwellings within the immediate locality vary and have been subject to alterations and extensions. Nevertheless, hipped roofs, catslides and pitched front gables are prevalent features of the street scene. The semi-detached dwellings, including the host dwelling, are generally in similarly designed pairs and this regularity also contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The roofline of the original catslide would be retained and the proposed rear dormer would be set below the main ridgeline and above the eaves with materials matching the existing roofscape. However, owing to the bulk of the hip to gable extension and the insignificant set-back of the proposed rear dormer, the proposed development would add significant massing to the roofscape and be disproportionate in size. As a result, the proposed development would be unduly dominant and visually discordant with the host dwelling.

6. Owing to its design and scale and the separation from its neighbour, the proposed development would be a notable and visually prominent addition to the roofscape when seen within the street scene. Whilst the adjoining semi-detached has a different style of side roof extension, the proposed development would nonetheless disrupt the hipped roof and symmetry with the front elevation of the adjoining semi-detached pair. This would be visible from Bourne Vale. Moreover, hip to gable side extensions and rear dormers are relatively uncommon features in the immediate locality. As such, the proposed development would be a harmful departure from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to alterations and extensions within the local area. However, none of the cited examples, including that at No.37 Bourne Vale are directly comparable in terms of setting, siting, design quality and appearance. In particular, none of them involve hip to gable extensions at properties with original catslides. For this reason, these developments do not justify the proposal as it can be distinguished from them.
8. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019). Collectively, these policies seek a high standard of design where the scale and form should complement the host dwelling and positively contribute to the street scene. Dormer windows should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. I sympathise with the appellant's desire to increase living space by providing an extra bedroom. However, the design and bulk of the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

A Humphries

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

David Smith

INSPECTOR