



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd of March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3354546

75 Barnfield Wood Road, Bromley, Beckenham, BR3 6ST

- 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 Tahaney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/02932/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations to create part gable end roof lines with rear dormer and front roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property sits in a row of detached houses in large plots, within a residential area of high visual quality. There is a pleasant cohesion in detailing such as white render and projecting gables with tile-hung bay window features. There is also uniformity in the street scene, due to strong building lines, house proportions, spacious front gardens, and the general rhythm in the roofscape of hipped roofs. The space between dwellings affords views towards their side elevations, where the return roof slopes and eaves lines generally correspond with the front elevations. This pattern contributes to the rhythm and uniformity of the street. The established high quality coherence of the area is recognised as it lies within the Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character designated in the development plan.
4. Various houses in the immediate vicinity have been extended. These are either subservient side additions, set-down and set-back, or they are flush with the front wall incorporating a roof expansion. In general, these integrate successfully as they follow the cohesive patterns, and roofscape rhythm that gives the area its special character.
5. The appeal property is of a design, scale and appearance that is consistent with, and therefore contributes to the special quality of the area. There is space either side of the dwelling, affording views towards the side elevations.
6. The proposed roof extension would include the significant raising of the eaves height to both side elevations, leaving a small element of hipped roof at the top of

the apex of a gable. This arrangement would significantly disrupt the prevailing roofscape rhythm. Moreover, it would harmfully alter the proportions of the front elevation, such that it would appear discordant with the cohesive pattern of development within the street scene.

7. In coming to my findings, I have taken account of the images of other extensions in the locality provided by the appellant and visited these when on site. Most examples, including 83A Barnfield Wood Road, relate to different house styles, or are within a different context. As such, they are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal which reduces the weight I attribute to them. Only 47 Barnfield Wood Road and 22 Woodmere Way share the same or similar context, as the appeal site's character area. In these examples, the gable roof extensions disrupt the prevailing rhythm and uniformity. Their presence reinforces my concerns rather than providing a sound justification for further similar development.
8. The dormer window extension would be contained to the rear of the appeal property, and the roof lights would not disrupt the roofscape rhythm. As such I accept that these elements would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have found in respect of the gable extensions.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such it conflicts with Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Local Development Framework, Local Plan, London Borough of Bromley, Planning Division, (adopted January 2019) (Bromley LP). Policies 6 and 37 require a high standard of design that responds positively to the host dwelling and local context, whilst Policy 44 requires new development to respect, enhance and strengthen special and distinctive qualities within Areas of Special Residential Character.

Other Matters

10. The appellant suggests that the development would adhere to permitted development volumes if outside of the Area of Special Residential Character. I have little evidence to support this claim, and in any event, I must assess the development on the merits of the scheme before me. I therefore attribute minimal weight to this point.
11. Representations received raise overlooking concerns, in relation to the proposed Juliet balcony within the dormer window to the rear. I note the Council's conclusion that increased potential for overlooking would not be significant, above that which already exists from the first floor windows of the property. Based on the evidence before me, and my observations of the orientation of the dormer and distances between dwellings, I agree with Council's assessment.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR