
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3174929

7 Greenfield Gardens, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1ES

- 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 Labeur and Ms Phillips against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/00117/FULL6, dated 11 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey side/rear and part front extensions with loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow and the proposal would extend the bungalow to the front, side and rear and add an additional floor including rear dormer windows and front roof lights.
4. UDP Policy BE1 requires all development to be of a high standard of design that, amongst other things, would not detract from the street scene. UDP Policy H8 establishes that alterations and enlargements of residential properties should be of a scale and form that respects or complements the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area, amongst other things¹.
5. The proposed enlargement of this bungalow with the addition of a first floor would significantly alter the appearance of the property. Due to the overall bulk and scale the pair of semi-detached properties would be unbalanced in appearance and be at odds with the character and appearance of the other bungalows in this locality. It would conflict with policies BE1 and H8.

¹ London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan, July 2006.

6. I note the appellants comments to a 'fall back' position in terms of what could be constructed under permitted development rights² but I do not agree that this justifies allowing a proposal that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
7. I have considered all other matters raised including the concerns of the adjoining neighbour but neither these nor any other matter raised alters my conclusion.
8. I conclude that the proposed extensions and loft conversion would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with UDP policies BE1 and H8 and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

² Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.