

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2016

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3156652
47 North Drive, Orpington, Kent, BR6 9PG.

- 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 Salacinsky against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref 16/01978/FULL6, dated 22 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a double storey extension to side, hip to gable extension and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey extension to side, hip to gable extension and rear dormer at 47 North Drive, Orpington, Kent, BR6 9PG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01978/FULL6, dated 22 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 scale location plan, elevations/block plan and floor plan submitted with the application.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the host dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the host dwelling, the pair of dwellings and street scene.

Reasons

3. North Drive originally comprised pairs of symmetrically designed two storey dwellings from a limited palette of designs, including fully hipped roofs. However, a significant number of the dwellings in North Drive have had side and roof extensions, including large rear dormers and hip to gable extensions. The resultant pairs of dwellings are asymmetrical and this has resulted in the street scene having a more diverse character and appearance.
-

4. Together the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and policies BE1 and H8 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP), require extensions to respect or complement the scale, form and materials of the host and nearby properties. New development should not detract from the existing street scene and should respond to local character and history.
5. The Council's Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance – No.1 General Design Principles (SPG1) and Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance – No.2 Residential Design Guidance (SPG2), likewise seek to ensure that new development respects the character of its locality. SPG2 advises that roof alterations should be designed to respect the form and appearance of the existing roof. This is in recognition that the roofs of buildings contribute greatly to the streetscape and roovescape of their localities.
6. The proposed side, hip to gable and rear dormer extension would reflect the design and appearance of other extensions within the immediate vicinity and would be readily assimilated into the street scene. At the same time the form of the proposed extension would respect the existing depth, eaves and ridge lines of the host dwelling. As a consequence the simple lines and uncluttered appearance of the pair of dwellings would be retained, notwithstanding its asymmetrical appearance.
7. It is acknowledged that a hipped roof would better respect the existing symmetry of the pair of dwellings. However, as indicated above, the proposed extension would respect the uncluttered form of the host dwelling and the proposed gable roof would respect the existing character and appearance of other pairs of dwellings in the immediate locality and the street scene in general.
8. As pointed out by the Appellant, the existing roof of the dwelling could be changed from hip to gable within the current permitted development tolerances. However, as the proposal requires planning permission for various reasons only a modest amount of weight is given to this factor.
9. Finally, the Council has suggested the imposition of conditions relating to the use of matching external materials and adherence to the submitted drawings. Both of these conditions are necessary to ensure that the proposed extension blends in appropriately with the host dwelling and in the interests of certainty.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would respect the scale, uncluttered form and materials of the host, adjoining and nearby properties and the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore comply with policies BE1 and H8 of the UDP, SPG1, the objectives of SPG2 and the NPPF.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR