



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2024 by T Mansfield

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3347969

37 Hillcrest Road, Bromley, Orpington BR6 9AN

- 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 Lily Liu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/00770/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as 'first floor side/rear extension (previously approved #22/03482/FULL6) and for a Loft Dormer 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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling in an area made up of other semi-detached properties. Development to the front and side of these properties is common and this has resulted in variation on the street in the scale of dwellings. Whilst there are also different roof styles present, these overwhelmingly have either a hip or gable end. In some cases, scale and roof form differ between semi-detached pairings, contributing to some level of asymmetry.
5. Historic development to the front and side of the appeal property has produced differences in appearance with its semi-detached partner. The two dwellings are asymmetrical in their scale and roof form, with the stepped down hip of the appeal property contrasting the full hip of its partner. The appeal property and its semi-detached partner therefore fit into the varied appearance of the area.
6. Although there is difference in their roof forms, the appeal property and its partner nevertheless share the pitch of their hipped roofs. This is a consistent characteristic throughout the area for semi-detached pairings that both have a hipped roof, including the properties put forward by the appellant. This means that despite some asymmetry, the hipped roof designs of paired properties

remain sympathetic to one another and it brings a sense of coherence to pairings in the street scene. Therefore, although there is variety in appearance to be found in the area, there is nevertheless a sense of place that the matched pitch of the existing hipped roofs contributes towards.

7. The proposed development would extend the roof of the appeal dwelling by raising the existing stepped ridge to the height of the main ridge and by increasing the pitch of the hip to provide room for a rear dormer. The resulting scale of development would not be significantly more than other examples of roof extensions already found in the area, so would not represent an overly dominant addition to the host dwelling.
8. However, by increasing the pitch of the hip, the proposed roof design would no longer be sympathetic to the neighbouring dwelling or the area. It would create an unbalanced roof form for the semi-detached pair, which would diminish the existing sense of coherence for the pairing. Furthermore, the roof pitch proposed would be distinctly and noticeably different to other examples of enlarged roofs in the area, including those referred to by the appellant. Consequently, those examples carry limited weight in my decision making and do not justify this proposal.
9. Although the materials used would be similar in appearance to those of the existing dwelling, the roof form of the proposal would not be compatible with development in the surrounding area and would not positively contribute to the existing street scene. Whilst I appreciate that this is a revised scheme aiming to improve on a previously rejected application, my assessment and recommendation are based only on the proposal in front of me.
10. Accordingly, for the reasons above, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) which, respectively, require extensions to be compatible with development in the surrounding area and expect a high standard of design.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has raised that the extension volume falls within fifty cubic metres and is not in a conservation area. In some circumstances, roof extensions are permitted development under planning legislation. However, in this case, as extensions have been made to the roof in the past, there is no substantive evidence before me that similar extensions could be undertaken without planning permission, such that there would be a viable fallback position. For this reason, the weight I can give to this matter in my decision making is limited and it does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal conflicts 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.

T Mansfield

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR