

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3163019

22 Crofton Lane, Orpington, BR5 1HL

- 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 & Mrs Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/03524/FULL6 dated 22 July 2016 was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension with replacement roof to provide habitable accommodation in the loft space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on the eastern side of Crofton Lane where nearby properties consist mainly of two storey detached houses. The properties are generally situated on consistent building lines although there is some variation to the north of the appeal site, where buildings sit in a staggered arrangement. Some dwellings are located in a backland position which are accessed past the side of the appeal site. However, the majority of properties in the vicinity of the site face Crofton Lane and are set back from the highway behind mainly low and open front boundaries. This layout, along with the spaces between properties and the presence of trees and landscaping within front gardens, contribute to the pleasant and open suburban character of the residential area.
 4. The proposal includes a two storey side and rear extension, which would be set back around 0.3m from the front building line and would utilise matching materials to the existing house. It would then extend along the full remaining length of the dwelling and beyond the current rear two storey element of the appeal property. The side extension would have a width of 2.5m and although it would extend the ridge line by 3.5m in width, I do not consider this to be excessive given the overall width of the existing property. The original roof would also be altered, although I note that the appeal development would not
-

exceed its existing maximum height. Consequently, whilst the proposal, including the rear extension, would increase the size of the roof, I do not find that its overall resulting scale and mass would appear unduly dominant on the host property.

5. The Council have also raised concerns about the 0.3m setback of the extension not being significant. I acknowledge the setback is limited, but the side extension would also be of a relatively limited width at 2.5m in comparison to that of the existing dwelling at over 7m. I am therefore satisfied that despite the short setback from the main front of the property and the lack of a set down of the roof, the modest width of the proposal at the front ensures that the appeal development would have a subservient appearance.
6. The proposed side extension would also incorporate a gable frontage, which in terms of its size and some of its detailing, would appear as a subordinate reflection of the projecting gable on the existing property. However, the narrow width of the projecting gable and the equally narrow windows contained within it, would give rise to a cramped appearance on the host property. I acknowledge the diversity in roof styles in the area and that unlike other properties, the appeal site has not been substantially extended. This does not however justify the introduction of a gable feature which would result in an awkward appearance on the host property.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. It would conflict with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, high standards of design.
8. The proposal would not adversely harm the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers or highway safety. I also note that certain parts of the development, such as the rooflights and the rear dormer were considered to be acceptable. These are however neutral considerations and not benefits of the proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including compliance with parts of the development plan relating to maintaining a sidespace gap, that the property is not located in a Conservation Area or Area of Special Residential Character, reference to Permitted Development rights and that no objections were received from nearby residents, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR