
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3176115

1 Home Lea, Green Street Green, Kent BR6 6LT

- 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 Mrs Sara Elliott against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/00463/FULL6, dated 30 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2017.
 - 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 host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two storey house located within a suburban residential estate. The presence of grass verges, street trees and well planted gardens, combined with dwellings set back in their plots and away from the highway gives the immediate area an attractive and spacious character.
 4. The house subject to this appeal is very prominently sited at the junction of the cul-de-sac, Home Lea, with Osgood Avenue. The proposed extension would be a sizable addition to the side of the dwelling. Though limited to single storey height, its width and lack of set back from the forward building line would, despite the presence of landscaping on the site, make it appear disproportionate in scale compared with the host dwelling. Furthermore the extension would mean the resultant building would cover nearly all of the plot width, harming the sense of spaciousness about the property and around the turn in the street. I noted during my visit that there is a pronounced slope along Osgood Avenue from east to west. However this would not serve to mitigate the visual impact of the development, considering the prominent location of the site.
 5. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. As such it would be in conflict with Policies BE1 and H8 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 insofar as they seek all development to be of a high
-

standard of design and in particular for extensions to respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and space about buildings.

6. The appellant has made the point that the decision to refuse planning permission would be inconsistent with developments at Nos 1 and 10 King Henry Mews and No 1 Wolsey Mews. I noted during my visit that the side elevations of these dwellings are nearer to the edge of the highway when compared with the existing appeal dwelling. However, they would appear to be set further in from the highway compared with the proposed extension. In addition, these dwellings are a little way to the east of the appeal site and not therefore in the immediate street scene. In any event they do not justify the harm I have identified in this case which I must consider on its own merits.
7. I acknowledge that nearby residents have not objected to the proposals. Notwithstanding this, I have a statutory duty to consider the impact of development even when no specific objection from third parties has been forthcoming.

Conclusion

8. For the aforementioned reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR