



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025 by E Clifford BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3355244

27 Chesham Avenue, Petts Wood, BR5 1AA

- 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 Michael Andrea against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref is 24/03118/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension; loft conversion incorporating front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension; loft conversion incorporating front and rear dormers at 27 Chesham Avenue, Petts Wood, BR5 1AA in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 24/03118/FULL6, and the plans submitted with it.

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 Matters

3. The appeal follows an application which sought planning permission retrospectively for development that has already been carried out. The LPA's decision indicates that harm would result from the front dormer only and the accompanying officer report identifies no concerns regarding the single-storey rear extension, the loft conversion or rear dormer. I have defined the main issue on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow located on a residential street. It is a part of a row of four pairs of semi-detached bungalows of the same style, and the street contains a variety of housing styles including modern detached properties, pairs of inter-war style semi-detached two-storey houses and the above-mentioned bungalows, along with some individually styled dwellings. The dwellings are all set behind front gardens, offering a spacious feel to the street, and the low massing of

much of the street and the wide spaces between the houses enhances this spacious character.

6. The current roof scape within the surrounding vicinity is predominantly characterised by hipped roofs, however there is no defining style for the street scene, as there are also a number of gabled roofs present including to the neighbouring bungalow at 29 Chesham Avenue (No 29). Front dormers are not a regular feature within the vicinity of the appeal site, although there are some present nearby.
7. The U-shape of the pair of semi-detached dwellings means that the forward projecting part of the host dwelling's roof partially conceals the mass of the dormer in more direct views from the street. This together with its position set well away from the roof of the attached semi and its matching tiles helps to assimilate the front dormer into the roofscape. Furthermore, owing to the lack of prevailing roof style, the dormer sits comfortably amongst the varied roof forms on the street.
8. I accept that the front dormer has reduced the symmetry across the semi-detached pair. However, the hip to gable enlargement carried out following a lawful development certificate¹ already reduced this symmetry. Even after the installation of the front dormer, the retained U-shape and forward projecting hipped roof ensure a suitable semblance of scale and design between the two in this particular instance.
9. I conclude that the front dormer has an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it accords with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019), Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021) and the Bromley Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023) which seek amongst other things to ensure that extensions respect the scale and form of the host dwelling, and that the development is compatible with the surrounding area.

Conditions

10. As the development has already been carried out and given my findings that it is acceptable in character and appearance terms, planning permission is granted in accordance with the plans submitted with the application and no further conditions are necessary in this instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

¹ LPA Ref 23/01825/PLUD

Chris Forrett

13. INSPECTOR