



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3340389

129 Homesdale Road, Bromley, BR2 9LE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Hussein Huseyin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/23/04216/FULL6.
 - 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 main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi detached property with a hipped roof. The adjoining property mirrors the site's two storey hipped roof form and design along with a pair of hipped roof properties and a terrace of three properties with the same roof design. The remainder of the street consists of similar two storey dwellings which creates a generally consistent character to the area, with hipped roofs the predominant form of roof design.
5. The proposed dormer would sit below the ridge of the roof with a depth marginally above the eaves height. The dormer would occupy a large proportion of the roof space and would envelope one of the eaves windows to the rear elevation. The resultant development would be a large, boxy and dominant addition to the rear roof slope, which would alter the existing dwelling's character and design. Although the proposed dormer 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 uniform quality of the area and encroach on the existing eaves window, a key design feature of the existing dwelling.
6. The rear of the appeal property is clearly visible and a prominent feature when viewed from Godwin Road in approaching the Homesdale Road junction. The

addition of the dormer would break the existing uniformity presented by the rear of the semi-detached dwellings, and because of its size and detailed design would appear as an incongruous feature.

7. I acknowledge that there is another existing dormer set within the stretch of hipped roofed properties on Homesdale Road. However, this is small in scale and sits in place of the previous eaves window and is therefore not directly comparable to the design of the appeal scheme. I have also had regard to the presence of other dormers in the area, albeit that I am satisfied these are not a defining feature of the character of the area. I also note there are no other dormers occupying the roof slopes of the hipped roofed properties close to the appeal site.
8. There is no dispute between the parties regarding the acceptability of the proposed front rooflights, and I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion. However, for the reasons as set out, the proposed dormer would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. As such it would fail to comply with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) which require development to be of high-quality design and compatible with the host property and the surrounding area.

Other Matter

9. The appellant also refers to a Permitted Development 'fall back' position of being able 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. However, although other such schemes may have been undertaken within the wider area, there is no evidence before me that such a 'fall back' position has been formally established for the appeal site, or an alternative scheme demonstrating how this might be achieved. This would therefore be a matter for determination through the submission of an appropriate application to consider whether such a scheme would be permitted development, and not a determination as part of this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR