



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2022

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 DECEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3292235

36 The Knoll, Hayes, Bromley BR2 7DH

- 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 Arnott against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/05522/FULL6, dated 15 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor side extension, loft dormer conversion, garage roof alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 36 The Knoll
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed ground and first floor side extension, loft dormer conversion, garage roof alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 36 The Knoll, Hayes, Bromley BR2 7DH dated 15 October 2021 and the plans submitted with it, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Preliminary Matters

2. From my visit and on the basis of the evidence before me, the extensions have been constructed and therefore the development is retrospective.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached house with a two storey front bay projection. The area is residential in character, mainly comprising semi-detached dwellings generally with hipped roofs, which previously would have shared an original built form. However, a significant number of the properties have been altered and many have first floor side extensions above their garages.
5. There are a number of examples within the streetscene where, as a result of side extensions, pairs of semi-detached properties are no longer entirely symmetrical. There are examples of pitched roof elements, at 21 and 25 The Knoll which do not match with the hipped roofs which are characteristic on the street. Also of particular note is the side extension at 37 The Knoll, opposite the appeal property, which, like the proposed development, has a hipped roof which is not subservient to the main ridgeline. This mix of extensions and roof forms is part of the character of the area.

6. It has been put to me that a previous approval¹ at the property was considered acceptable as a result of the side extension's subservient roof form. Whilst the appeal proposal's higher ridgeline is not subservient, and therefore is not symmetrical with the extension at 34 The Knoll, I do not find that it unacceptably unbalances the pair of properties. The extension is similar in width to the side extension at No. 34, ensuring that it remains proportionate to the host dwelling and the pair of semis, as a whole. The facing materials used for the side and roof extensions complement the property so that the extension is not easily distinguishable from the original dwelling, whilst they also match with the materials at No. 34.
7. Although the roof is not subservient and is more bulky than No.34's roof, its hipped form is in keeping with the host property and the prevailing character of the area. Overall, the side extension is not dominant and does not have an unacceptable unbalancing effect on the pair of semi-detached houses.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed extensions do not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the adjoining dwelling or surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Bromley Local Plan (2019) Policies 6 and 37 which, amongst other aspects, seek to ensure high quality design which does not harm the streetscene or host building.

Conclusion

9. As the development has been constructed and completed there is no need to impose any conditions in this instance.
10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and accords with the development plan and the Framework. The appeal is therefore allowed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Bromley reference: 20/02130/FULL6