

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2017

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3164270

16 Kent Close, Orpington, Kent, BR6 7HD

- 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 Paul Nash against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref: 16/04351/FULL6 was refused by notice dated 4 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is: Rebuild existing garage to incorporate a pitched roof. Erect a single storey rear and side residential extension. Erect a rear dormer at roof level to incorporate residential space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.16 Kent Close is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area. The upper part of the cul-de sac of Kent Close is mainly lined with rows of semi-detached dwellings. The dwellings at either side of the appeal building are of a similar form and design, with timbered front gables. Some have been altered, including the addition of a flat roofed two storey side extension to No.20 at the head of the cul-de-sac. However, their overall design and appearance has generally been retained.
4. The Council considers that there would be no harm from the proposal to the amenities of neighbouring properties. I see no reason to disagree because there would be no significant increase in overlooking, loss of daylight/sunlight or privacy for neighbours from the proposal.
5. The Council also considers that the proposed gable and roof extension would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings because the adjoining dwelling has not extended its roofline. It is apparent that Nos.11 and 31 on the opposite side of Kent Close have extended their roofs to form gables rather than hipped roofs.
6. The proposed roof extension would alter the symmetry of the roof of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. However, the design of the dwellings is not entirely symmetrical because of the position and roof form of the garages. Whilst the original design concept would be changed, the degree of harm to the street scene from such a change would be limited.

7. Although the decision notice refers to “the proposed pitched roof over the single storey side extension” I note that the roof referred to is over a side garage and would in part provide additional storage space. The proposed roof to the garage would be a significant addition to the front elevation of the building when compared with the continuous low roof slope that runs from over the garage to the centre of the building’s front elevation. This is also a characteristic design feature of similar neighbouring buildings. I agree with the Council that the proposed re-built garage would appear excessively bulky because of its height, reaching almost to the eaves of the main roof.
8. The proposal would conflict with policies H8 and BE1 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan, which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development complements the scale, form and layout of the host dwelling and adjacent buildings and does not detract from the existing street scene.
9. I have taken all other matters raised into account. However, for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR