

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3166834

31 The Highway, Orpington, BR6 9DQ

- 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 P O'Rourke against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/04817/FULL6, dated 17 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and 2 storey side extension, addition of rear dormer and roof windows to the rear roof.
-

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 locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a well proportioned two storey semi-detached dwelling on a tapering plot in an area of established residential suburban character and pleasing appearance. Amongst a range of types the dwelling is one of a number of local semi-detached homes which display broad degrees of symmetry and a characteristic cat slide roof to the side elevation. This home does vary from the others in that the plot is irregular and the extra side space accommodates a detached low key single garage. The street is predominately one of two storey semi-detached dwellings of similar period and scale albeit with some elevational variation, although a detached bungalow lies adjacent to this site. The proposal is as described above and would result in additional living space and facilities and bedrooms along with new integral garaging arrangements. The current side garage would be demolished as part of the scheme.
 4. The plots of this semi-detached pair of dwellings are asymmetrical but this is not what stands out to the eye. Like other homes locally it is the dark brick facades which catch the attention and the appeal property reads as one of a symmetrical pair and the last one in a row of similar houses. A particular feature of merit of these properties is the side cat slide roof which is aesthetically agreeable and adds to the street scene quality. Regrettably this
-

would be absorbed and consumed into the appeal scheme which would add a different style of elevational and roof form and do so via considerable and excessive additional bulk. This would be the case despite an attempt to introduce some subservience with a modest step-back and set-down relative to the main part of the host property and the fact that there would be some gap retained to the shared side boundary. The proposed change would be dominant in the street, jarring on the eye, and detract from the present scene. It would be compounded by the added prominence of this side elevation through long street views being available, the plot sitting on a relatively high ground level, and an adjoining bungalow rather than a two storey property being alongside.

5. The London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 includes saved Policies BE1 and H8 which, taken together and amongst other matters, seek well designed new development that should protect local distinctiveness, complement the locality, have regard to siting, and not detract from the existing street scene. For the reasons given above I conclude that there would be conflict with these policies.

Other matters

6. I do sympathise with the wish for additional, useable, accommodation. I noted the attention which has been paid in terms of the selection of matching materials and window design and positioning. I appreciate that there are no residential amenity or highway safety related objections raised and the site does not lie within a Conservation Area. I have considered other extensions drawn to my attention. I do not know their full circumstances, repetition in one or two cases would be visually unfortunate, and I could not see any directly comparable by reason of siting, scale or design. I must, in any event, determine the case before me on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
7. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR