



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5TH March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3333491

9 Silverdale Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, Bromley, BR5 1NH

- 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 Alan Jenkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/23/03043/FULL6, dated 4 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with the construction of a set back half gable and rear dormer with a crown roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with the construction of a set back half gable and rear dormer with a crown roof at 9 Silverdale Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, Bromley, BR5 1NH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/23/03043/FULL6, dated 4 August 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan at scale 1:1250 and Drg Nos 1589/1, 1589/2, 1589/3, 1589/4, 1589/5, 1589/6, 1589/7, 1589/8, 1589/9, 1589/10 and 1589/10A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC), as defined within the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (LP), being a large residential area comprising mostly detached and semi-detached properties of various styles in an overall pattern that follows the garden suburb principle. An Article 4 Direction is in place that

is designed to protect the front roof slopes of all properties within the Petts Wood ASRC.

4. Together with its attached neighbour at No 11, the appeal property forms part of a hipped roof, symmetrical pair of dwellings. Their design is repeated at intervals along Silverdale Road and the surroundings as is typical for the development pattern within the ASRC. The proposal is for a loft conversion that would involve a side extension of the existing hipped roof and a rear dormer.
5. The Council has raised no concern with the size or appearance of the proposed rear dormer. I have no reason to disagree. The concern is that the proposed side extension would unbalance the semi-detached pair and that this would detract from the original hipped roof form of the dwelling and the positive contribution that it makes to the area.
6. Silverdale Road comprises almost exclusively semi-detached pairs of similar age properties but variety in terms of appearance and detailing, with several repeat designs. Although each pair would have originally been symmetrical, I was struck during my visit by those properties that had been altered in a variety of ways including at roof level. Many properties have retained their original hipped roof form, but it is also the case that many semi-detached pairs are now unbalanced as a result of past alterations to some. Regardless of when these alterations took place, or whether they were the result of permitted development or past planning permissions, the changes now form part of the established character of the area. As a consequence, I do not consider that a visual imbalance to the appearance of Nos 9 and 11 would necessarily appear out of keeping within the street scene.
7. The appeal proposal would retain the existing spacing with the unattached property to the side at No 7. In addition, the proposed side extension would be slightly recessed behind the existing front roof slope with the ridge tiles to the existing hipped roof to the front retained, thereby defining the form of the original roof to a degree and helping the extension overall to appear sufficiently subservient. The half-hipped roof design of the side extension would also reflect a design feature that is prevalent locally without excessive bulk, and would not look out of place. With the use of matching materials, which could be controlled by condition, I find overall that the proposal would respect and positively contribute to the street scene and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the property and the wider established context of the ASRC.
8. Based on my findings, there would be no conflict with LP Policies 6, 37 or 44 as I am satisfied that the extension would display a sufficiently high standard of design that would respect the host dwelling in terms of scale, form and materials of construction, and which would be compatible with development in the surrounding area, thereby respecting the distinctive qualities of the ASRC.
9. The Council has referred to various appeal decisions in the vicinity which they suggest relate to similar forms of development. However, I have been presented with no specific details of these. In addition, the appellant has drawn my attention to other examples within the ASRC where appeals have succeeded. Rarely are two cases exactly the same and I have been presented with no substantive evidence to demonstrate that this is the case. The range

of alternative decisions merely demonstrates to me that each case has been determined on its own merits.

Conditions

10. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the proposal is finished with materials that would match the existing.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I find that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the appeal property or to the surrounding area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR