



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 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: 1st November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3327758

89 Hayes Way, Beckenham BR3 6RR

- 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 Bourke (Task Security Services Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/23/01626/FULL6, dated 25 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as roof alterations to include hip to gable extension & side dormers.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The description of development has been changed by the Council and there is no evidence of an agreement between the main parties to do so. I have therefore used the description in the heading above, as it appears on the application form which, in any event, appears to sufficiently describe the development to which the appeal relates.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area with specific regard to the Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character (PLASRC).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal building is a large two-storey detached Dutch barn style dwelling. It is one of a row of eight such properties that are well preserved. The PLASRC has the appearance of a garden estate that represents a coherent and easily identifiable area. In the case of the immediate street scene, originality and consistency contribute positively to its character and appearance.
6. A key characteristic of the Dutch barn style is the shape and profile of the roof which would be significantly changed by the proposed side dormers. Whilst the dormers would be set back, they would be highly visible, both from the front and rear street scenes, on a prominent roof slope, creating an uncharacteristic

addition to the shape and form of the distinctive roof. This incongruity would adversely affect an important feature of the building and how it relates visually to others in the immediate area, unacceptably interrupting its consistency and originality. It would, as a result, fail to respect the special and distinctive qualities of the PLASRC.

7. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to comply with Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), insofar as they require residential extensions to be of a good design that complement the scale and form of the host dwelling, contribute positively to the street scene, and enhance the special qualities of the PLASRC.

Other Matters

8. The scheme at No 65, reference 22/04/30/FULL6, is very different to the appeal proposal in that there is one dormer, and it appears to respect the shape and form of the roof. I cannot be certain of what existed prior to that application and what merits of the scheme were considered. The same can be said of the alterations to No 69, reference 21/04331/FULL6. The scheme at No 87, reference 07/03147/FULL6, was determined under a different development plan. The extension in this case is also subservient to the main dwelling and respects the shape of the hip roof.
9. The scheme at No 63, reference 95/02520/FUL is of some considerable age, having been granted some 27 years ago. Consideration of design acceptability has changed significantly since then. APP/G1580/D/23/3316535 concerns a two-storey hipped roof property and not a Dutch style. In addition, it was for only one dormer that is significantly different in length and form to the subject appeal proposal.
10. With this and the above in mind, I am not persuaded to change my conclusions and recommend that the appeal be allowed. These dormers are part of the character of the wider area, but their existence does not, for the reasons I have given above, justify them being deployed in every case and in every size and design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR