



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3342735

31 Manor Way, Petts Wood, Bromley BR5 1NN

- 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 Sarah Chambers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is 24/00379/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as 'addition of front roof lights to plans approved under previous planning decision, ref: 23/03706/FULL6'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion comprising a hip to gable roof, a rear ground floor extension, rear dormers and front rooflights. (Revision to approved application ref: 23/03706/FULL6 to include hip to gable roof and front rooflights) at 31 Manor Way, Petts Wood, Bromley BR5 1NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00379/FULL6, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing Nos 2298-23-P01 Revision R9, 2298-23-P02 Revision R9, 2298-23-P03 Revision R10, 2298-23-P04 Revision R7 and Location Plan Scale 1:1250 (Date Produced: 30 January 2024).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

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 Matters and Main Issue

3. The appeal scheme is broadly similar to that referred to in the decision paragraph that has proceeded it. The description in the banner header above is taken from the application form but, as confirmed on the decision notice, the proposed development included the other elements which previously had planning permission. The key changes as part of the appeal scheme are the way in which the hip to gable conversion is to be carried out and the addition of some rooflights.

4. The Council do not object to the loft conversion, hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer windows or the rear ground floor extension. I have no reason to disagree with their conclusions. My recommendation therefore focusses on the two proposed rooflights to the front roof slope. Their effect on the character and appearance of the area, with specific regard to the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC), forms the main issue of the appeal.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. The houses of Petts Wood were built over a number of years, in a number of similar though varied styles, the road layout and plot sizes were established in an overall pattern. That layout remains broadly intact and contributes positively to the special character of the ASRC. Within that context, the appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse featuring a hipped roof, a forward gable section and a two-storey bay window feature to the front. The adjoining semi-detached property at No 29 is of similar design and features a hip to gable roof extension. The street features a mix of two-storey properties with a degree of consistency in their appearance, partly through the recurrence of materials including render, brickwork, timber and hanging tiles. Whilst there is a visual coherence the street scene, there is some variation in the style of the houses, as well as in roof design where there are examples of hipped, gable and catslide style roofs. Many of the houses on Manor Way and within the streets nearby have roof alterations including hip to gable extensions, dormer windows and rooflights on the front roof slope.
6. The rooflights would be of a modest scale and would not appear as an overly prominent feature within the extended hip to gable roof. They would be flush within the roof slope which would reduce their visual impact and help to visually integrate them within the roof slope. Furthermore, on my site visit, I observed many examples of similar roof extensions on Manor Way and within the nearby streets of Hazelmere Road, Woodland Way and Townscourt Crescent. This included numerous unmatched pairs of semi-detached houses including at Nos 33 and 35 adjacent to the site, where No 33 has a half hip to gable roof extension in contrast to No 35 which has a hipped roof. There are further such cases of roof extensions having created unmatched pairs of semi-detached properties in the area, including roof extensions with a much greater unmatching effect than would be experienced as a result of the rooflights at the appeal site. Viewed within this context, the rooflights on the front roof slope would not spoil the character and appearance of the host building or the locality.
7. The proposal would not therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area or the special qualities of the ASRC. It would therefore comply with Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan which together require that proposals are of a high standard of design, respect and complement the host dwelling and the surrounding area and respect, enhance and strengthen the special and distinctive qualities of the ASRC.

Other Matter

8. The Council have drawn my attention to several planning applications relating to the insertion of rooflights in the area which were subsequently dismissed at appeal. Copies of the appeal decisions have not been provided. These appeals appear to be some distance away from the appeal site. I have not therefore had the benefit of a site visit to these areas and have not therefore been able

to establish how these decisions may or may not be relevant to the appeal before me. Moreover, each appeal case is assessed on its own merits.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and referred to the approved plans for enforcement purposes. I have included the requirements for matching materials in the interests of respecting the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed since it would comply with the development plan.

T Morris

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 allowed, subject to the conditions set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR