
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3165853
1 Willow Close, Orpington, Kent BR5 2AZ

- 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 D Machin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/04319/FULL6, dated 7 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached house, part of a residential estate comprising a mixture of two storey dwellings and bungalows. It is adjacent to a cul de sac entrance, in close proximity to the junction of several streets, namely Willow Close, St Andrews Drive and The Greenway. It is therefore in a very prominent position.
 4. Dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site, though varying in size, are generally set back from the public footway, therefore maintaining a sense of spaciousness to the surroundings. In addition the host dwelling is at the end of a line of semi-detached properties in Willow Close that are of very similar scale and design. This gives a sense of visual rhythm and uniformity to the street scene.
 5. The proposal would utilise a significant part of the space to the side of the dwelling, extending to the boundary of the property with the adjacent footway. Though set back from the front elevation of the dwelling and screened to a degree by the boundary fence, the extension would become wider towards the rear, running parallel to the tapered line of the boundary rather than the side elevation of the dwelling.
 6. Whilst I accept that a side extension to a house would not be unusual in principle, the extensive coverage of the development in this case would remove
-

the spaciousness to the side of the property, giving it a cramped appearance. In addition, its conformity with the tapered side boundary line would make the extension appear contrived to maximise the available space rather than proportionate and subordinate to the width of the main dwelling. Furthermore, the prominent siting of the development at the cul de sac entrance would serve to disrupt the previously identified visual rhythm in the street scene. Contrary to the appellant's point, I have not been provided with any evidence that the Council operates a policy of permitting any single storey extension to the side boundary.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a side extension that has been constructed at No 36 Moorfield Road. I have been given very little information about this and am not therefore fully aware of the circumstances of that case. However it appears to me that that property is a considerable distance from the appeal site. Accordingly it would be unreasonable to regard the development there as forming a precedent and in any event it would not justify the harm that I have identified in this case.
8. For the above reasons I conclude that the development would be an incongruous addition that would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider street scene. Accordingly it would conflict with Policies BE1 and H8 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 insofar as they seek to secure a high standard of design that respects the scale and form of the host dwelling and is compatible with development in the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other points raised including the lack of harm that would be caused to the living conditions of neighbouring residents, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR