
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3165036

59 Chelsfield Lane, Orpington BR5 4HG

- 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 Miss Sarah Ray against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02832/FULL6 was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a wrap-around extension.
-

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 surrounding streetscene.

Reasons

3. Saved Policies BE1 and H8 in the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) seek, amongst other matters, for extensions to complement the scale and form of adjacent buildings. Saved UDP Policy H9 specifically states a normal requirement for new residential extensions as follows: *for a proposal of two or more storeys in height, a minimum one metre space from the side boundary of the site should be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building*. A more generous side space may be required in areas of higher standards of separation.
 4. I consider the above policies are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.
 5. The appeal site lies within a primarily residential area at the end of a row of two-storey semi-detached properties of similar scale and design. This row is characterised by gaps of various sizes at first floor level between the semi-detached properties. I consider that these gaps and the uniformity of scale of
-

this group make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscene.

6. The adjacent property is single-storey with a wide gate to the side. There is an existing gate and shed to the side of the appeal property. The proposal includes a two-storey side extension, with a wrap-around element reducing to a single-storey rear projection. The proposed two-storey side extension would be situated close to the side boundary. This would not be in accordance with the one metre gap normally required in saved UDP Policy H9.
7. The appeal property is situated in a prominent raised position. Due to the scale and design of the proposed side extension, I consider that it would appear as a cramped form of development, not in keeping with the scale and form of surrounding development. It would significantly diminish the gap at first floor level between this dwelling and the dwelling at No. 61 Chelsfield Lane. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene.
8. The appellant has stated that the neighbour has offered to sell a metre of land. However, due to the reasons stated above, I do not consider this would overcome my concerns with regard to the spacing between buildings.
9. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised, including examples of developments elsewhere. None are directly comparable to the proposal before me. I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to saved UDP Policies BE1, H8 and H9.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR