

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3173927
36 Goddington Lane, Orpington, BR6 9DS.

- 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 Sven Tsankov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/00581/FULL6 dated 29 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor side extension and erection of pitched roof to existing rear extension.
-

Preliminary matter

1. There are a number of discrepancies between the existing dwelling and the submitted drawings. In particular, the existing rear dormer extension and the roof lights in the front roof slope are not shown on the existing or proposed plans. In addition, the height and form of the adjacent dwelling at 34 Goddington Lane (No.34) is inaccurately drawn. These are all matters that could be dealt with by condition and so have not affected my ability to determine this Appeal.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the street scene and the area.

Reasons

4. The area in which the Appeal site is located is characterised by semi-detached and detached two storey family houses which vary in their design and materials. The curved alignment of some of the roads, together with the staggered building lines, generous sized mature landscaped gardens all contribute to the informal, spacious and verdant character and appearance of Goddington Lane and the surrounding area.
 5. The Appeal dwelling comprises one of a pair of uniformly designed semi-detached two storey dwellings with centrally located two storey projecting bay windows, which dominate the dwellings. The Appeal dwelling has a small first
-

floor side extension, which whilst utilitarian in appearance is located towards the rear of the dwelling and so has a negligible impact on the overall character and appearance of the dwelling within the street scene.

6. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), states that new development should respond to local character, reflect the identity of local surroundings and add to the quality of the area. At the same time planning decisions should not discourage appropriate innovation. Policy H9 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) requires a minimum one metre gap to be retained between the side boundary of the site and the full height and length of the flank wall of the building, where extensions of two or more storeys in height are proposed. This clearly applies to extensions over existing single storey wings as well as two storey extensions built from the ground up.
7. The supporting text to this policy advises that adequate separation should be retained between dwellings to safeguard privacy, to prevent a terracing effect or a cramped appearance and to protect the high spatial standards of the area.
8. The proposed extension would sit a short distance behind the front wall and below the ridge line of the host dwelling. It's detailing respects that of the host dwelling and a condition could be imposed which it required it to be constructed from matching materials. In addition, the existing flat roofed extension at the side of the dwelling would be removed. In these respects the proposal would both reflect and respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
9. The proposed pitched roof over the existing rear flat roofed extension would in theory improve the appearance of the dwelling. However, bearing in mind that there is a large dormer extension adjacent to this extension it could be difficult to design a pitched roof which did not look awkward. This is however a matter which could be dealt with by condition and if necessary the flat roof could be retained. As such it does not weigh against the proposal.
10. However, the proposed extension would project forward of the dwelling at No.34 and would be materially taller. The difference in height is emphasised by the fully hipped design of the roof at No.34. Due to the combined height, forward projection, expanse of flank wall and proximity to No.34, the proposed first floor extension would be visually stark and the resultant dwelling would totally dominate the dwelling at No.34. The relationship between the two dwellings would be visually cramped and would fail to respect the character, appearance and spatial qualities of the Goddington Lane and the surrounding area.
11. This harm could not be addressed through the imposition of conditions. It would outweigh the benefits for the Appellant and his family that would result from the additional living accommodation and a home with greater energy efficiency.
12. I acknowledge that there are a number of side extensions of various heights in Goddington Lane and the area as a whole, however I saw none that were directly comparable to the proposed Appeal scheme. This includes the extension at 35 Goddington Lane, which was allowed on Appeal. That particular extension sits at a lower level to the adjacent dwelling and its roof hips away from the boundary.

13. I conclude that the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the street scene and the area, contrary to policy H9 of the UDP and the NPPF.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR