
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2023

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 MAY 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3308420

7 Martins Close, Orpington BR5 3LA

- 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 Adam Cooper against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/00693/FULL6, dated 16 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a hip-to-gable roof extension with front and rear dormer, Juliet balcony and new windows to side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of the proposed development as set out by the Council as this more accurately reflects the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this modest semi-detached bungalow which is located within this residential area. The locality is dominated by semi-detached bungalows although there are a few examples of 2 storey houses.
5. Martins Close rises steeply from Augustine Road and contains 7 bungalows set around the head of the cul-de-sac. Originally, these and the other bungalows in the area had hipped roofs. Nos 2 and 3 Martins Close have had a hip-to-gable extension with rear dormers and Nos 4 and 6 have front dormer windows but have retained part of the original hipped roof. I saw no other examples of front dormer windows in the locality.
6. Policy 6 of the Council's Local Plan 2019 (LP) states that dormer windows should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches, unless dormers are a feature of the area. Whilst there are 2 dormer windows within the front roof slopes of properties within Martins Close, very nearby, these are isolated examples and there are no others within the area that have been drawn to my attention. In this context, I

consider that they are not a feature of the area; rather, they appear as anomalies within an area that otherwise does not contain front dormers. In addition, the Council points out that these front dormers are of some age, dating from the 1970s and possibly undertaken as permitted development at that time and under a different regime of permitted development and within a different Policy context. Therefore, I do not regard the existing front dormers as a precedent within the area that should be followed.

7. The proposed dormer would be on the most prominent roof-slope of this property. It would be readily visible within the street-scene of Martins Close. Furthermore, the proposed width of the dormer would be greater than those at Nos 4 and 6 and the overall impact of the proposal would be greater due to the hip-to-gable extension. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would appear unduly dominant and would have a considerably negative effect on the character and appearance of the street-scene here. As a result, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 6 and 37 of the LP. I have taken account of the appellant's stated family needs for additional accommodation. These are matters which would be of a personal and individual family benefit but would not outweigh the longer lasting and public impact of the proposal, in my judgement. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR