



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 28 March 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3353332**

**28 Manor Way, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1NW**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Rodrigo Dupleich against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley
  - The application Ref is DC/24/02327/FULL6.
  - The development proposed is the demolition of chimney, construction of loft conversion with a hip-to-barn hip gable end, rear roof dormer and two front roof lights.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, in a generous rectangular plot, with a striking cat slide roof on its side. Four similar properties lie together and the road as a whole comprises mainly semi-detached homes of stature, visual interest and varying designs. The locality is of established residential character and the dwellings, gardens and generous street come together to create an area of distinctive and attractive good quality suburban appearance. Aesthetic qualities of the locality are recognised; the appeal property lies within the designated Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). The proposal is as described above.
  4. Regrettably, to my mind, the appeal scheme would lack the necessary sense of subtlety and modesty of scale which I would deem to be a requirement for any change or addition to this attractive roof shape which is presently largely symmetrical with the adjoining home and two beyond. The development would be too bulky, too tall, overly prominent and unsympathetically fenestrated. The original roof form would be visually swamped by the scheme and an attractive architectural feature would be virtually lost to the detriment of the qualities of the host property and the wider streetscene. The appeal scheme would lack any appropriate degree of subservience.
  5. Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan are relevant. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek well-designed development which is appropriate to a site and its setting and of a suitable scale, appearance and
-

character to protect local distinctiveness generally and to strengthen the qualities of an ASRC. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run contrary to these policies.

*Other matters*

6. I understand the wish to enlarge this dwelling, to help optimise the use of the site, and I appreciate that the scheme would bring benefits to occupiers. I can see that the Appellant has made attempts to overcome a range of previous concerns via design, positioning and scale changes but these do not go far enough in my opinion. I have considered other extensions drawn to my attention, and also additional ones I observed locally, but found none to be directly comparable given scale, positioning and context. Furthermore, in my mind they do not necessarily set a benchmark for good design which could encourage replication. In any event, I must assess this case on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant, but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
7. The National Planning Policy Framework has been considered and the development plan policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

*Overall conclusion*

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR