



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3232721

42 Midfield Way, Orpington BR5 2QL

- 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 and Mrs S Workman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/00519/FULL6 dated 31 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension over garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property sits in a prominent location on the corner of Midfield Way and The Avenue, which has an open character by reason of the wide grass verge. Despite a shallower verge on the opposite side of The Avenue, its spacious character is maintained on the opposite side of the road. This is because the side elevation of the adjacent 40 Midfield Way is set back from the footway and because its bulk is broken up through its single storey side element. The open character is replicated on the other corners of the junction.
4. The appeal proposal would add significant additional bulk and width to the property at first floor level above the existing garage, dining and utility space.
5. Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan (BLP) (2019) is relevant. The aim of the policy is to retain space around buildings, particularly at first floor level, partly in the interests of visual amenity. Policy 6 of the BLP is also relevant. Amongst other things it requires that in relation to residential extensions, space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.
6. It is accepted that the extension would be set back slightly in excess of the minimum required 1 metre from the side boundary of the site. However, the policy notes that where higher standards of separation already exist, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space.

7. The wide grass verge to the western side of The Avenue is noted as well as the design of the extension which would be no higher or deeper than the existing dwelling and which would incorporate the same hipped roof form and use materials to match.
8. However, the significant size, bulk and full width double storey design of the extension, combined with its siting close to the boundary of the property, would result in it forming an overly dominant feature in the street scene which would harmfully erode the space between the appeal property and No 40. This impact would only be accentuated as The Avenue sits at a slightly lower level comparative to the appeal property which would make the extension even more prominent.
9. Consequently, the appeal proposal would significantly erode the open character of the area and would therefore be contrary to Policies 6 and 8 of the BLP which seek to protect such characteristics. It would also be contrary to Policy 37 of the BLP which seeks a high standard of design and layout within developments.

Other Matters

10. My attention has been drawn to a two-storey extension that has been built at 2 Walsingham Road. However, very limited details relating to the circumstances of this scheme have been supplied. It is also not located on Midfield Way and therefore shares a different context. I cannot therefore afford this example any significant weight. In any event, each case should be considered on its own merits.
11. The appeal proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on the living conditions of nearby occupiers. However, this is a neutral impact.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

TJ Burnham

INSPECTOR