
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 May 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3172725

59 Willett Way, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1QE

- 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 G Ellis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/05236/FULL6 was refused by notice dated 11 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is ground floor side, rear extension and front elevation and roof alteration.
-

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 Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character.

Reasons

3. The Council has not raised concern regarding the proposed single-storey side and rear extensions and I note that these have subsequently been granted planning permission. The remaining parts of the proposal for my consideration are the proposed first floor front elevation and roof alteration.
 4. The appeal property lies within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character. Policy H10 in the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) requires development in this area to respect its established and individual qualities. Whilst there is a variety of different house design, the road layout and plot sizes in this area create an overall pattern.
 5. The Appendix to Policy H10 specifies that the space between proposed two storey development and the side boundary of the site should accord with that prevailing in the area. From my observations, the prevailing characteristic of this area is for gaps between dwellings and where there are side projections, they are predominantly single-storey projections. This retains characteristic gaps at first floor level.
 6. UDP Policy H9 requires a minimum one metre side gap for two-storey extensions or greater where higher standards of separation already exist. In
-

the circumstances of the proposal before me, I consider that the appeal site lies within an area where higher standards of separation already exist.

7. The proposed front gable would add symmetry to the existing detached dwelling, replicating the existing front gable. However, in doing so, it would significantly narrow the gap at first floor level with the adjacent dwelling at 57 Willett Way. Due to the prevailing pattern of development, the position of No. 57 Willett Way on a higher ground level and the resultant narrow gap between these neighbouring properties, I consider that the proposal would create a terracing effect and appear cramped in the established streetscene. This would be to the detriment of the spatial standards of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character. This would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
8. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised, including the side extension to the adjacent dwelling at 57 Willett Way. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to UDP Policies BE1, H8, H9 and H10, where they seek high quality design that does not detract from the existing streetscene. I consider these 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 taking account of the different roles and character of an area and should be seeking to ensure high quality design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR