

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 09 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3157548
132 Tubbenden Lane, Orpington BR6 9PR

- 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 and Mrs Lam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02003/FULL6, dated 24 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension to rear and conversion of loft.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two storey property located on the northern side of Tubbenden Lane. The property has a hipped roof with interlocking concrete tiles. The surrounding area is predominately residential comprised of detached and semi-detached properties also with hipped roofs. The proposed extension would create a rear hip to gable extension and an extension to the first floor.
 4. The proposal would result in an extension of significant mass and bulk which would dominate the host property. In addition, the ridge of the proposed extension would be the same height as the ridge of the host property. Consequently, the extension would not appear as subservient to the host property. Furthermore, the resultant three storey gabled roof extension would be at odds with the prevailing two storey hipped roofs of surrounding properties.
 5. Moreover, the proposal would be highly visible to the occupiers of neighbouring properties due to the degree of inter-visibility to the rear. Indeed due to the significant separation of the appeal property and its neighbours, the flank elevations of the proposal would also be visible from the road. The visual impact of the extensions would be increased due to the elevated nature of properties on the north side of Tubbenden Lane. Taking these factors in combination, the appeal proposal would be an incongruous addition to the host property which would be at odds with the prevailing character of the area.
-

6. Attention is drawn to a planning permission for a first floor extension and roof lights to the side and rear which was granted 29 January 2016. I noted that this permission is in the process of being constructed. However, this would result in a smaller extension to the ridge and the hipped roof profile would be retained. This extension would, therefore, have a less harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The presence of this fall back position does not, therefore, justify the harm which I have identified.
7. Attention is drawn to other extensions in the area, although, no details are provided. However, there did not appear to be any extensions in the immediate vicinity of the same scale and mass as the appeal proposal or which have resulted in almost a three storey property. Consequently, none of these cases are directly comparable to the appeal proposal which limits the weight which I can attach to them in my Decision.
8. For the reasons stated above, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would, therefore, conflict with Policy BE1 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan (2006) which seeks to ensure that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, are of a high standard of design and layout.

Conclusion

9. For the reason stated and taking all other considerations into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector