



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 OCTOBER 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3347685

Bramcott, 54A Sunningvale Avenue, Biggin Hill, Bromley TN16 3BX

- 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 Rafael Benato against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/01049/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed loft conversion and roof uplift".
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The appeal form uses the description on the decision notice. However, I am satisfied that the description on the application form, which I have used above, accurately describes the development to which the appeal relates.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a detached bungalow in which the roofline is the most prominent element viewed from the street by virtue of the land levels sloping down to the west. Whilst the unit is not of significant architectural merit, the original roofscape is proportionate therewith and, by association, the wider street scene. Immediately neighbouring the unit are other bungalows which are also stepped back from the highway. With the wider area being a mix of two storey dwellings and chalet houses which sit closer to the highway. Whilst the roof forms vary, the most common are a mix of gable roofs and hipped roofs which contribute positively to a conventional feel to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposal would result in a mansard style/agrarian type roofline that would be raised to be in line with the immediate neighbours. With which it would sit comfortably in overall height terms. That said, its shape and design would

appear unconventional and thus awkward alongside other similar bungalows and, in form terms, the two storey examples. In addition, the bulk of the roof raising would result in a unit which would appear unduly prominent when exiting Sunningvale Close and along Sunningvale Avenue. It would be alien and detract from the homogenous quality of the collective set of bungalows in the vicinity. There is a varied architectural styling locally but, the roof type proposed is not commonly found in this location and it would, consequently, be an incongruous and unsympathetic addition, detracting from the prevailing roof forms and harming, as a result, the character and appearance of the area.

7. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019, the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and Policies D1 and D3 of The London Plan 2021 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard, amongst other things.

Other Matters

8. It is not sufficiently clear that the proposed development is the only way of meeting the increased internal space requirements of the incumbent family. I therefore attach moderate weight to this personal need. I understand there is a need to upgrade the existing roof, however it is also not sufficiently clear that the appeal proposal is the only way of doing this. I therefore ascribe moderate weight to this matter.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The appeal scheme would give rise to the harm I have described and, as a result, not comply with the development plan. I would give this substantial weight. I have been given no compelling reason, taking into account the weight I would attach to the other material considerations advanced, to deviate therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR