



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3331017

52 Manor Way, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1NW

- 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 Prashant Jajodia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref. DC/23/02318/FULL6, dated 14 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a minor extension to existing loft dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area, having regard to the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, semi-detached house on Manor Way. The local neighbourhood is residential in nature and comprises detached and semi-detached properties of considerable variety in terms of their design and detailing. Many have been previously extended at roof level.
4. Within this multi-faceted environment, I consider that the addition to the existing roof element at the side and rear would not appear incongruous. The scheme is relatively minor in its scale and extent and would be set away from the eaves below to retain a sense of articulation. To my mind, it would visually connect with the overall appearance of the host dwelling, without dominating it, and respond to the original design characteristics.
5. An imbalance between the appeal dwelling and the adjoining semi is already present at roof level, and I am of the view that the development would not exacerbate this situation above and beyond that which currently exists.
6. Notwithstanding my reasoning on the side dormer, the proposals include two rooflights in the front elevation; from the plans these would appear to be excessively large. Whilst I appreciate that there are numerous other examples in the streetscene, these are more modest in size. Furthermore, one of the rooflights would be prominently and awkwardly located just above the eaves level of the extended side dormer, which would appear discordant in the context of the roofslope.

7. I appreciate that the scheme would provide for an improvement to the internal accommodation and that the materials proposed would match those of the existing property and neighbouring dwellings. However, these matters would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. On this basis, although the extension to the dormer is acceptable, I am drawn to conclude that the proposed rooflights to the front elevation would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area, having regard to the ASRC. This would be contrary to Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the LP, which seek to ensure proposals meet high standards of design and protect the character of neighbourhoods.

Conclusion

9. In respect of the arguments above and all other matters put forward, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR