

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3227032

64 Felstead Road, Orpington, BR6 9AE

- 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 Tim Calvo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/00718/FULL6, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-floor side and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 64 Felstead Road and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located within a sub-urban residential street comprising properties of mixed character and age. The semi-detached pair are symmetrical in appearance, with a two-storey central core and cat-slide roofs to each side elevation extending down to a single-storey eaves height. The proposal would include extending the property to the side with a first-floor addition and a hipped roof over.
4. The proposed works would completely remodel the appearance of No 64. Its characteristic catslide roof would be lost in favour of a more traditional hipped side roof that would show little respect for the simple but distinctive form of the original building. The side addition would be a dominant feature that would unbalance the pleasing symmetry that exists with the attached neighbour at No 62. The unsympathetic nature of the extension would be further reinforced by the width of the first-floor addition, which would overhang the existing ground floor, albeit by just a small margin.

5. My impression overall is that the modified form of No 64 would appear disjointed and poorly composed as a whole, with the design of the new works failing to respect or complement the host dwelling. This would be in direct conflict with the requirements of Policy 6 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019, which deals specifically with residential extensions, and the more general standards of design quality required by Policy 37.
6. My attention has been drawn to several examples along Felstead Road where similar other properties peppered along its length have been modified significantly beyond their original form, notably at Nos 12, 14, 16, 20, 24 and 48. I recognise that some of these alterations bear a close resemblance to the appeal proposal. However, I have not been presented with any of the planning background to any of these. Furthermore, these examples demonstrate to me the visual harm that can occur to the cohesive qualities of a street scene through unsympathetic changes. I accept that the street scene is varied, and that an alternative form of development to an existing building need not necessarily be harmful, but in this instance, for the reasons given, I have identified clear conflict with the current and recently adopted policies of the development plan. These, together with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, place significant emphasis upon high quality buildings and places through good design.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of 64 Felstead Road and the wider street scene. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR