



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18/10/2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3304112

18 Ravensbourne Avenue, Bromley BR2 0BP

- 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 Genc Rumani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/01003/FULL6, dated 4 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof extension with an L shaped dormer and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey semi-detached house which is located within the Shortlands Village Conservation Area, which was designated in September 2021. The property sits on the eastern side of Ravensbourne Avenue and is one of a number of similar semi-detached houses which are to the south of the car park to the golf club.
4. The houses within this section of the road are all of similar proportions and a number are of repeated designs. The Lodge at the beginning of the road and numbers 2 and 4 (which appear to be a later in-fill) differ, although are not out of place in their appearance. The house at No 18 has a 2 storey rectangular bay on the front elevation, with a small hipped roof over it. The main roof is also hipped. The great majority of houses on this section of the road have hipped roofs, the exceptions being No 6 and the attached neighbouring house at No 16, both of which would have had hipped roofs originally but have gabled roofs with rear dormers.
5. Notwithstanding the existence of Nos 6 and 16, the overwhelming impression is of hipped roofs which form a consistent feature, helping to unify the buildings on this section of the road. I consider these to be a positive feature in their contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The side gables appear as exceptions to this character which I judge to be

disruptive and having a negative impact. It would appear that these extensions to the roofs were constructed prior to the designation of the area as a Conservation Area. Within the context that I have identified, I consider that the proposal would have a negative effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

6. The appellant states that the proposal would replicate a form of development that already exists in the conservation area and it would help to balance the extension on the attached house. Whilst this would be the case, for the reasons set out above, I find that the existing gabled roofs are negative features and so should not be replicated. Any benefits of balancing with the neighbouring roof would be outweighed by the inappropriate visual form of the proposal, in my view.
7. The appellant indicates that the proposal would provide much needed additional accommodation for his family. I have no reason to doubt this but these would be private benefits and the proposal would remain long after these considerations would cease to be relevant.
8. I consider that the harm to the Shortlands Village Conservation area that would arise from the development would be 'less than substantial' harm as identified in the National Planning Policy Framework. I have weighed this against any public benefits that may arise from the proposal and judge that the harm would not be outweighed.
9. Taking all matters into account, I consider that the proposal is contrary to Policies 6, 37 and 41 of the Council's Local Plan 2019. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR