



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2023 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3321579

129 Homesdale Road, Bromley BR2 9LE

- 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 Dr Daniel Moses (Property Wealth Corporation) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref 22/04522/FULL6, dated 15 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'Proposed Loft Conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a two storey semi detached hipped roof dwelling. The adjoining dwelling has clearly been extended, mainly over two storeys to the side. That extension follows the building in terms of the position of its walls and shape of the roof. The street scene is made up of very similar buildings of heights, roof shapes and setbacks from the road that contribute positively to a pleasant consistency.
5. The proposal would not raise the ridge height or affect the front roof slope of the dwelling. However, the dormer would occupy a significant proportion of the rear roof slope, being level with the ridge and in close proximity to the eaves. It would be tall, boxy and appear overly large, lacking subservience to its host. It would interrupt and visually dominate the roof slope, reducing the quality of the street scene's consistency, being noticeable as it would from Godwin Road to the north. Consequently, and although it would use appropriate materials, it would not respond positively to the original architecture or roof form of the host building and would unacceptably erode the quality of the area's consistency.
6. As such, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local

Plan (2019), insofar as they require development to be of high-quality design that respects or compliments the host property.

Other Matters

7. The appellant draws attention to the possibility of seeking a Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) to change the main roof from a hip to a gable under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GDPO) Schedule 2 Part 1 Classes B and C. It would not however be for my recommendation to determine whether such would be lawful, this would be for the submission of a LDC to consider, which is not in the evidence. In any event, my concerns in regard to the appeal relate to the dormer and no part of the appeal scheme relates to changing the current hipped roof to a gable. Any works that could be carried out under the permitted development regime are such that does not require, in the case of Classes B and C, a submission to the Council for approval. It could thus operate without consideration of the effect it would have on the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant has also drawn attention to many other properties within the area that have benefited from maximising their permitted development rights to obtain larger roof space conversions and other extensions. I cannot be certain which properties benefitted from which schemes either as a result of express planning permission or otherwise. And having visited the site, they do not appear to relate to the context in which the appeal scheme would be appreciated. My recommendation would thus be unchanged.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The appeal scheme would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other material considerations worthy of sufficient weight to find otherwise. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis I dismiss the appeal.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR