



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2024 by S Indermaur MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3340634

43 Charterhouse Road, Orpington, Bromley BR6 9EJ

- 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 Mr George Howell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/23/04116/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and roof alteration to accommodate a new bedroom, office, dressing area and bathroom. New roof with 3 no. dormers. Roof angle changed from 30 Degrees to 45 Degrees. Roof height increased by 835mm.
-

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 property and wider street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling positioned opposite the junction between Charterhouse Road and Cheltenham Road. The property has previously been extended to the side and is seen in context with a row of properties that are situated on the same side of the road and on an incline. These dwellings do not share a common building line but project forwards in a staggered line. The host dwelling demonstrates a consistency in architectural design to the row of properties with rendered elevations, hipped roofs, and bay windows to the front façades.
5. Criterion DG5 of the Bromley Urban Design Guide 2023 (DG) states that proposals should ensure that roof forms are proportionate in size and should be designed to minimise the visual impact on the street and positively respond to the character of the area.
6. The combination of the proposed increase in ridge height, hip to gable roof, loss of small front gable and larger gable, and introduction of a dormer window would significantly alter the existing roofscape and create a development with a top-heavy appearance. The proposal would therefore conflict with the guidance

set out in the DG. The alterations in design and added bulk to the roofscape would undermine the contribution made by the top left bay window, which is a key characteristic of the area. This would not complement the scale and form of the area as exhibited in the existing and adjacent buildings.

7. I acknowledge that there is some variety in design within the wider street scene and there would not be an obvious increase in ridge height between the properties because of the existing topography and separation. However, the appeal property is viewed in context within a row of properties that have consistencies in design and occupies a comparatively prominent location within the street scene when approaching the junction and travelling along Charterhouse Road. It is this position which would exacerbate the impact of the proposal and its incongruity when viewed within the street scene.
8. Turning to the proposed front dormer window, it would be modest in size, with a similar roof form and alignment with the windows below. However, front dormer windows are not a predominant characteristic of the area, and as such it would appear as an uncharacteristic addition. Although I accept that No.1 Cheltenham Road has a number of dormer windows that are visible from the street scene, I recognise that these are found on the side rather than the principal front elevation of the property. These therefore occupy a different context within the street scene, and which I am mindful are by no means a predominant or prevalent characteristic.
9. In assessing the design of the rear dormer windows, taken in isolation I am satisfied that they would be of a broadly acceptable design and would have a limited visual impact. However, it is clear that this element of the scheme would not be divisible from the elements which would be harmful.
10. The appellant has referred me to examples of hip to gable extensions and roof extensions within the area. Nevertheless, I note many of these properties are located within a markedly different context, and do not therefore present the necessary justification to allow the development as proposed. In any event, each case must be considered on its own merits and therefore do not have the same effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, these matters wouldn't mitigate the harm identified.
11. For the reasons detailed above, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. The proposal would not accord with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 which together seek development that positively contributes to the existing street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR