



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2020

by M Seaton DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3239247

72 Ridgeway Crescent, Orpington, BR6 9QP

- 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 Kerrie Parker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/03083/FULL6, dated 15 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and rear elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling set on the inside of a bend within Ridgeway Crescent. The overall site is 'wedge-shaped' with the widest part of the site along the street frontage. An existing single-storey detached garage is positioned on the boundary with No. 74 Ridgeway Crescent.
4. The proposed development would comprise the demolition of the existing single storey detached garage and erection of a two-storey side extension of 5.4 metre width on the front elevation, but 2.4 metre on the rear elevation with the flank elevation running parallel to the boundary with No. 74 Ridgeway Crescent. The extension would possess a hipped roof with eaves and ridge heights consistent with that of the existing dwelling and would also include design detailing to mimic that of the existing dwelling.
5. In determining the planning application, the Council has drawn my attention to Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 (the Local Plan). These policies seek to ensure that the design and layout for residential extensions will be of a scale, form and materials to respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area, as well as maintaining spaces or gaps between buildings where these contribute to the character of the area or the street scene.

6. The proposed extension would, when viewed within the street scene, represent a substantial addition almost doubling the width of the two-storey element of the existing dwelling, although I acknowledge the width of the extension to the rear would be significantly less due to the shape and constraints of the site. The bulk and scale of the proposed extension would overwhelm the existing character of the dwelling and the resultant dwelling would significantly unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. I accept that the design detailing of the proposed extension would be appropriate in the context of the host dwelling, as would the use of matching materials, and that the proposals maintain a limited gap between the flank elevation of the proposed extension and the neighbouring boundary. However, the absence of any subservience in respect of the extensions from the host dwelling would fail to ensure any visual mitigation or differentiation of the extensions from the existing dwelling.
7. The appellant has contended that there are other examples of similar development within the area with reference made to previous extensions to No. 171 Tubbenden Lane, Nos. 36 & 38 Ridgeway Crescent, and No. 6 Ridgeway Crescent. However, it would appear from the submissions that the extensions at No. 171 Tubbenden Lane and Nos. 36 & 38 Ridgeway Crescent have adopted a degree of subservience in their scale and form with the ridge height having been set down in both instances, as well as the first floor being set back at Tubbenden Lane. These examples are not therefore comparable.
8. With regards No. 6 Ridgeway Crescent, I accept the form of the apparent extensions to this property appears to be similar to that which has been applied for on the appeal site. However, the circumstances as to how this development came to be are not before me, and I have therefore restricted my assessment to the planning merits of the proposed extensions.
9. As a consequence, the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and would conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Local Plan.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the appellant's concerns regarding the absence of any cooperation from the Council with regards revisions to the design, and the absence of an arranged site visit by the Council Officer. Whilst I recognise that these are matters of concern for the appellant, they do not have any bearing on my decision-making and have not therefore influenced my determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR