



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2022

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3288294

8 Westholme, Orpington BR6 0AN

- 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 Ross McEwen against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/03361/FULL6, dated 25 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension and a hip to mansard loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and that of the local area, with reference to the Knoll Area of Special Residential Character (the Knoll ASRC)

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey house on the north side of Westholme, a close off Mayfield Avenue with a wide variety of designs of residential properties, many of which appear to have been the subject of some form of alteration and/or extension. The appeal property is located on that part of the close prior to its opening out to create a turning head.
4. The topography of the area is such that the land rises towards this turning head. The local area of the close is characterised by its generously proportioned detached and semi-detached two storey houses, situated in the Mayfield Avenue part of the Knoll ASRC, designated for its special and distinctive qualities.
5. The proposal includes a first floor rear extension that would integrate with the existing property and its roof line, regularising the first floor rear building line. The proposed loft conversion and roof extension would add to the height of the appeal property and would alter the existing fully hipped roof to a half hipped crown roof form with a gable end to the existing bay fronted element on the main elevation. 3 large flush fitted rooflights are proposed on the front roof slope, with a further 6 flush fitted rooflights proposed for the rear roof slope. 3

- upstanding roof lights are further proposed to the flat part of the crown roof that would be visible in wider views of the appeal property.
6. The proposed first floor rear extension, gable front to the projecting bay element of the appeal property and the inclusion of flush roof lights in a rear roof slope would be architecturally sympathetic and subordinated additions to the appeal property that would reflect similar existing properties and additions and alterations evident to other residential properties in the local area. However, due to its height and bulk, the combination of a raised half hipped crown roof form with raised roof lights to the flat area of the crown roof would result in an incongruous and disproportionate appearance in relation to the appeal property.
 7. The location of the appeal property at the top of the rise towards the end of the close at Westholme results in the appeal property being prominently positioned in the local street scene. This is particularly when viewed from the lower part of Westholme. The proposed raised height, crown roof form, flush rooflights to the front roof and upstanding roof lights, which would appear to be potentially visible from surrounding viewpoints, would result in the appeal property appearing as incongruous. Given its prominence, as identified above, this would be readily apparent within the context the roof profiles and forms evident in the local streetscene and would not, therefore, reflect the special residential character of the Knoll ASRC.
 8. The appellant has brought to my attention other crown roof forms that have been permitted in the local area. I find, however, that, unlike the proposal, these do not appear to also incorporate a half hipped roof form or upstanding roof lights. I have, therefore, only afforded this little weight in my considerations.
 9. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the wide variety of form and architectural expression evident in the properties in the local area, including the infill development at 3A Westholme, the access to which is directly opposite the appeal property. However, whilst I agree that the local area does demonstrate this variety, I find that, unlike the effect of the proposal on the appeal property, the properties in the local area demonstrate proportion and congruity of their roof forms in relation to their host property, particularly where they have undergone alteration or extension.
 10. The appellant has indicated that the appeal property would benefit from the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO) with regard to permitted development set out in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA. They have also indicated that an Article 4 direction under the provisions of the GDPO was due to come into force in March 2022 that would remove such permitted development rights. I have not been made aware that such an Article 4 Direction has come into force. However, notwithstanding that the appeal property may benefit from the provisions of the GDPO or that there may be a restriction to permitted development in place, the proposal before me is by way of an application for planning permission.
 11. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the character of the Knoll ASRC. This would be contrary to policies 6, 37 and 44 of

the Bromley Local Plan (2019), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design, integrate with the local area and respect, enhance, and strengthen the special and distinctive qualities of Areas of Special Residential Character.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR