



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2023

by S Lo LLB M.SRA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3301417

102 Village Way, Bromley, Beckenham, BR3 3PA

- 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 Tim Ward against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/01317/FULL6, dated 28 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a rear dormer & hip to gable extension to an existing converted loft space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development has been completed. As such, I have dealt with this appeal on the basis that the proposed development has been completed largely in accordance with the plans, notwithstanding that the setback with the adjacent property appears to be smaller than indicated on the Proposed Rear Elevation plan (P-005A).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the streetscene and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The application site consists of a two-story semi-detached dwelling situated on a residential street. The development is a dormer which incorporates a hip to gable extension. Prior to the development, the roof was a hip shape, which sloped from the ridge down to the eaves.
5. The properties along Village Way and the surrounding area are similar in age and overall design, albeit several of these properties have been enlarged through dormer extensions. Specifically, I observed that no 104 and no 106 Village Way, possessed dormer extensions, albeit the existing hip to gable structure had been retained for those properties. These dormers are significantly smaller than the development and both are set back from the edge of their respective roofs. None of the dormer extensions which I observed in the vicinity incorporated such a significant part of the existing roof space as the development. Additionally, the majority of properties which I observed along Village Way do not have any dormer extensions. Consequently, dormers of the

scale and size of the development are not a common or characteristic feature of the area.

6. From a front street scene perspective, the rear facing bulk of the dormer is not significantly visible from the front street scene. However, the hip to gable extension does result in a highly visible alteration to the appearance of the roofline of the appeal site through the loss of the previous hip shape and replacement with a square frontage. From a rear perspective, there is some limited screening of the development in some angles from nearby trees, however, due to the size and scale of the extension it remains clearly visible from Whitmore Road and Bramerton Road, as well as the footway access path alongside Bramerton Road. As a result, the development adds considerable bulk to the roof as a whole and would be a visible presence in front and rear views from the surrounding properties, roads and footpaths in the area.
7. In reaching this view, I have considered the Council's calculations that the conversion adds 80m³ of added volume, which is a proportionally significant amount in relation to the scale and form of the original roof. This figure has not been contested by the Appellant, but it observes that the reduction in the width of the dormer down to 7m would produce an unfortunate roof design. No further information has been provided as to why this would be the case. Regardless, the current design of the development adds considerable bulk, massing and volume to the roof, which would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area.
8. Without a set down from the ridge line, a very minimal set in from the party wall and the incorporation of a hip to gable extension, the dormer occupies almost the entirety of the rear roof. This has resulted in a box-like and bulky appearance. Consequently, as it would be highly visible from surrounding properties, I find that the proposed development would appear as a prominent and discordant feature which would be out of keeping with, and harmful to, the appearance of the property and the wider terrace.
9. The Appellant points out that planning permission has been granted for roof alterations at other properties in the area, in addition to those which I observed at 104 and 106 Village Way. However, I am not aware of the particular circumstances of those cases. In any event, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits, and in the context of the current policy regime which requires such additions to complement the scale, proportion and form of adjacent buildings. Whilst there are other isolated properties in the area which have been enlarged through dormer extensions, this does not undermine the requirement for the appeal scheme to respect the prevailing local character where such extensions are not a common feature.
10. In conclusion, the appeal scheme would harm the character and appearance of the streetscene and surrounding area and would therefore not comply with the requirement for development to reach a high standard of design and layout, contrary to Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Development Framework Local Plan (2019)

Conclusion

11. I have found that the appeal scheme conflicts with development plan policy and thus find that it would be contrary to the development plan as a whole. No material considerations have been demonstrated which would outweigh the

planning development conflict. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Lo

INSPECTOR