



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2025

by **P H Wallace BSc (Hons) DipMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/25/3373061

20 Crossway, Petts Wood, Bromley, Orpington BR5 1PF

- 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 Giles Skillicorn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is 25/03340/HPA
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion with a half gable and rear pitched roof dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with a half gable and rear pitched roof dormer at 20 Crossway, Petts Wood, Bromley, Orpington BR5 1PF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/03340/HPA, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan, drawing numbers 1767/1 (Existing Ground Floor), 1767/2 (Existing First Floor), 1767/3 (Existing Side Section), 1767/4 (Existing Rear Section), 1767/5 (Proposed Ground Floor), 1767/6 (Proposed First Floor), 1767/7 (Proposed Loft Plan), 1767/8 (Proposed Side Section), 1767/9 (Proposed Rear Section), 1767/11 (Existing Elevations), 1767/12 (Proposed Elevations), 1767/14 (Location Plan) and 1767/15 (Existing and Proposed Roof Plan).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The scheme comprises a rear dormer and a half-gable roof extension. The Council's case does not challenge the dormer; it is not cited in the reason for refusal and the submitted evidence identifies no conflict with relevant development plan policies. Following my site visit, I find no reason to disagree. Accordingly, the focus of this appeal is the proposed half gable roof addition.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, including the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

Reason

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached property with a hipped roof, matching its neighbour, located in the Petts Wood ASRC. Petts Wood is a 1930s garden-suburb of predominantly detached and semi-detached houses on large, regularly spaced plots with an open, tree-lined suburban character. This ASRC designation identifies the consistent front rooflines, the limited incidence of roof-level alterations, and the matched symmetry between pairs (and neighbouring pairs) of dwellings as key attributes that establish the area's rhythm, visual cohesion and overall character. Policy 44 of the Bromley Local Plan (LP) requires development in the ASRC to respect, enhance and strengthen these distinctive qualities.
5. The appeal dwelling and its neighbour, when read with the adjacent semi-detached pair at Nos. 16 and 18, form a clearly defined group. This relationship is emphasised by their close proximity and the pronounced gaps to either side, created by the rear gardens of properties fronting the streets that run perpendicular to Crossway.
6. The strong sense of symmetry exhibited elsewhere within the ASRC is less evident in the immediate vicinity of the site owing largely to the full-gable addition at No.16 and the side dormer on No.18's hipped roof which faces the site. Within the gap between the semi-detached pair, the appeal property also has a rear two-storey pitched-roof extension. This projects beyond the main flank wall facing No.18 and introduces a subtly competing roof form that, from certain parts of the street, slightly imbalances the paired composition. In addition, the close alignment of notably differing garage roof forms along the common boundary contributes further to a juxtaposition within the gap, which diminishes the legibility of the original symmetry and balance.
7. The proposal would result in a half-hipped gable end facing No.18. Although this would introduce some asymmetry within the semi-detached pair, the effect would not be discordant given the existing variation in rooflines and forms across these dwellings. The scale of the addition would be comparable to that carried out at No.16, which does not appear unduly excessive in relation to the parent dwelling. From certain vantage points, the addition would also provide partial screening of the rear pitched-roof extension. In this context, the proposed half-hip would not unduly detract from the appearance of the appeal dwelling and would sit comfortably within the immediate street frontage.
8. Reference has been made to planning permissions granted by the Council and to allowed appeals concerning adaptations to hipped roofs within the ASRC. While the factual circumstances of those cases are not directly comparable, they nonetheless include examples of asymmetrical alterations to semi-detached pairs, including half-hipped proposals. Taken together, these examples demonstrate that the proposal would not be uncharacteristic of development elsewhere in the ASRC, a conclusion that is reinforced by my own observations on site. I note the Council's

view that some roof extensions in the area may have arisen under permitted development tolerances; however, my assessment must take the character of the area as it presently exists, irrespective of the circumstances under which individual developments were carried out.

9. Taking these factors into account, I conclude that the proposed development would not unduly detract from the character or appearance of the host property, nor from the semi-detached pair of which it forms part. It would not prejudice the established character of the Petts Wood ASRC, which would thereby be safeguarded. On this basis, the scheme accords with Policy D3 of the London Plan, Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Local Plan, and the Urban Design Guide SPD (Bromley 2023), which, amongst other things, seek development that respects local character and delivers contextually appropriate design.

Other Matters

10. The Council is satisfied the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours. I observed no evidence that an unacceptable impact would arise.

Conditions

11. The Council suggested a limited set of planning conditions which I consider necessary. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition specifying the relevant drawings provides certainty. The materials condition is necessary to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal accords with the development plan as a whole and the Framework, and therefore the appeal is allowed.

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR