

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3164661

19 Repton Road, Orpington, BR6 9HR.

- 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 Ian Drury against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/04493/FULL6, dated 26 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a double storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. Repton Road is characterised by a limited range of symmetrically designed pairs of two storey dwellings, interspersed with occasional detached houses. The Appeal property is located in a prominent position adjacent to the junction of Repton Road and Cranleigh Close. It is at the end of a uniform row of symmetrically designed dwellings with fully hipped roofs and pairs of adjoining projecting gables with cat-slide roofs. The prominence of the cat-slide roof gables is accentuated by the fully hipped main roof and the staggered alignment of the fenestration within the gables.
 4. The pair of dwellings on the southeast side of the junction with Cranleigh Close are similarly designed and together with the Appeal dwelling contribute to the spacious, uniform and well balanced entrance to Cranleigh Close. Whilst the dwelling at 21 Repton Road has a single storey side extension, it is subservient to the host dwelling and does not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the original building or the street scene.
 5. Together and amongst other things, policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), require new development to be of a high
-

standard of design and layout and to add to the quality of the area. Domestic extensions should be attractive, complement the scale and form of the existing and adjacent buildings and should reflect the identity of local surroundings. In addition two storey side extensions should be sited a minimum of one metre from the side boundary of the host property.

6. The proposed extension would be in line with the existing front and rear buildings lines as well as the existing main eaves and ridge line of the dwelling. It would have a gable roof and a large flank wall to the side and would project close to the back edge of the pavement in Cranleigh Close.
7. As a result the proposal would materially reduce the prominence of the front gable and its cat-slide roof and would totally unbalance the pair of dwellings. It would detract from the sense of rhythm within the row of dwellings and its continuity with the adjacent dwelling at No.21. At the same time, due to its mass, lack of detailing and proximity to Cranleigh Close the proposed flank wall would be visually stark and would have an enclosing impact on the area around the junction of Cranleigh Close and Repton Road.
8. Overall, the proposed roof and two storey side extension would be visually incongruous and would undermine the prevailing character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. This harm would outweigh the benefits of removing the existing pre-cast concrete garage and could not be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions. It would also outweigh the benefits for the Appellant and their family which would result from the proposed additional living accommodation.
9. It is acknowledged that there are a number of two storey gable end extensions in the locality, although none of those referred to by the Appellant relate to dwellings with such prominent gable features with cat-slide roofs to the front. Nevertheless some of the hip to gable extensions referred to highlight the impact that such extensions can have on the character and appearance of pairs of dwellings and their setting.
10. Finally, in itself, the proposed single storey extension to the rear of the existing dwelling would be visually subservient to the host dwelling and would not harm its essential characteristics. However, it forms an integral part of the overall scheme being physically and functionally linked to the proposed side extension. As such, it is not possible to issue a split decision in this instance.
11. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed extension would seriously and unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the pair of dwellings and the street scene. Accordingly it would conflict with policies BE1, H8 & H9 of the UDP and the NPPF.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR