



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2020

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3241201

37 Birchwood Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1NX

- 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 Ridgeway against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/02995/FULL6, dated 8 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is garage conversion to habitable accommodation, single storey side addition at first floor under a pitched roof. Raised roof to the front elevation, hipped roof to the rear elevation. Juliet balcony to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site includes a large detached 2 storey dwelling located within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character where the important defining character is identified as including regularity of front and rear building lines, consistency in front roof lines, symmetry between pairs and neighbouring pairs of houses, separation between houses and a spacious character.
4. Whilst the proposal would maintain a side gap of some 1.1 metres with the neighbouring property, the proposed additional second storey would add bulkiness close to the boundary resulting in an enclosing effect at odds with the spacious character of the area. It would not therefore retain a sense of openness.
5. The appellant has referred to other 2 storey extensions close to the site boundary in the vicinity of the site which I observed on my site visit. However, such examples do not reflect the prevailing character of the area. Similarly, the presence of gables at second storey height at neighbouring properties do not mitigate the harm that would be generated by the proposal. The design and position of the gables are different in terms of orientation, location in relation to the main façade and side boundary to that in the case before me and therefore are not directly comparable.

6. The presence of secondary gable roofs may be a feature of other properties in the road but the proposal would not create a symmetrical front façade to the dwelling, as proffered by the appellant. The location and size of the gable within the scheme would create an incongruous addition as a consequence of the unbalanced proportions.
7. Whilst the site is located in an area where the principle of residential extensions is supported, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore conflict with the part of Policy 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (Local Plan) which requires new development, including extensions, to complement the scale, proportion and form of the surroundings and positively contribute to the existing street scene. It would also conflict with the part of Policy 44 of the Local Plan which requires development in areas designated as Areas of Special Residential Character to respect, enhance and strengthen their special and distinctive qualities, along with the relevant part of Supplementary Planning Guidance No.2 Residential Design Guidance relating to a requirement for extensions to respect the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR