



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2022

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3307095

3 Downs Hill, Bromley, Beckenham BR3 5HA

- 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 Hauke Schrempf against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref: DC/22/01089/FULL6 dated 10 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of the existing garage into a flexible habitable space along with re-organising the ground floor layout. The property has an existing ground floor rear extension which we will be re-building with a new green roof that ties in the existing garage. We are proposing to convert the loft and replace the existing roof with gables to the front and the rear of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed roof extensions on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling on the south western side of Downs Hill, close to the junction with Ravensbourne Avenue and within a predominantly residential area. Downs Hill rises from the junction with Ravensbourne Avenue towards the north west, with houses on the south west side only, along this section of the road. The houses date from a similar period, including both detached and semi-detached. Although there are variations in the roof forms, the properties are of similar scale and proportions and the houses appear to step up the hill.
4. The proposals would undertake a number of changes to the property, including the raising and altering of the roof to accommodate a second floor of accommodation. The existing main hipped roof would be raised in height and the front and rear hips would become gables with a new ridge running front to back.
5. The increase in the ridge height and the change to the roof form would combine to form a discordant and top-heavy appearance to the existing

- building. This would be evident both from the front and the rear as well as the flank elevations. The roof alterations and increase in height of the roof would not complement the proportions and form of the existing property.
6. The change to roof form would also result in the property become visually intrusive and incongruous in the street scene. It would not respect the predominant pattern of development in the local area. I have taken into account that there is a greater variety of house forms and sizes in the wider area, including along Ravensbourne Avenue, but the property, as existing, reads as part of the group of houses rising up Downs Hill. In this context, the proposed change in the scale of the property particularly at roof level and therefore in its overall height would detract from the predominant pattern of development and would be a discordant element in the street scene.
 7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not respect but would harm the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. This would conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which, amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
 8. The Council's reason for refusal on the application decision notice also refers to Policy 41 of the Local Plan which refers to development in conservation areas but the Council has confirmed in its appeal papers that the appeal site does not lie within a conservation area, nor adjacent one, as addressed by Policy 42 of the Local Plan and briefly referenced in the Officer's report. The Appellant's documentation also confirms that the property is neither within nor adjacent a conservation area. I have not therefore referred to this matter or these policies further.
 9. The proposals include a number of other elements which would primarily relate to changes and alterations at ground floor level. The Council raised no concerns over these elements and from all the information before me and my site visit, I agree with this conclusion. However, they do not override the harm I have concluded as a result of the proposed roof changes.
 10. I have also taken into account the environmental benefits proposed but there is no information before me to suggest that these are necessarily dependent on the proposed alterations to the building before me.
 11. The Appellant has raised concerns over the length of time taken to process the application, but this is a matter for discussion with the Council. My decision is based solely on its planning merits.
 12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR