



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3242578

5 Irene Road, Orpington BR6 0HA

- 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 Elaine Aleppo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/03373/FULL6, dated 5 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2019.
 - The proposed development is demolition of rear extension, new single storey rear extension, part-one part-two storey side extension, dormer window to replace two small dormers at rear of property, first floor extension to existing flat roof, new two-storey projecting bay to replace single storey bay at the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a detached bungalow with roofspace accommodation and an integrated garage, which is situated within a prominent location on the corner of Sequoia Gardens and Irene Road. The appeal property has been subject to various extensions at the rear. The front elevation is characterised by two matching bay window features that flank the front entrance, with a dormer window positioned directly above the entrance. The symmetrical arrangement of these four elements contributes positively to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the streetscene. While there is a sense of architectural cohesion along Sequoia Gardens, there is more variety along Irene Road.
 5. The proposed extension to the northern side of the appeal property would be comparable in scale and design to the integrated garage on its southern side. As the front door would occupy a central position within the front elevation of the resultant property, it is considered that the scale and design of the proposed side extension would have a balanced appearance that would respond positively to the proportions of the host dwelling. Furthermore, due to the
-

extent of the side extension's setback from the side boundary, this element of the proposal would not have an overtly bulky appearance when seen in public views.

6. However, the proposed replacement of one of the existing front bay windows with a large two-storey front extension would result in a clearly asymmetrical front elevation. In contrast to the pleasing composition of the existing front elevation, the combined height and width of the proposed front extension would appear as an overly dominant and obtrusive feature that would relate poorly to the proportions of the other front bay window and therefore cause an unacceptable level of harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property. Given the appeal site's prominent corner position, the resultant front elevation would have a particularly incongruous appearance within the streetscene and so would have a deleterious effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. It is acknowledged that the appeal site lies outside of the Knoll Conservation Area. I also note that there have been no objections to the proposal. Furthermore, the Council have no objection to the proposed extensions and alterations to the rear of appeal property or to the proposed alterations to the vehicular access and I find no reason to disagree with this view. Nevertheless, this would not alter the harm that would arise, as set out above.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 6 of the Local Plan (2019), which states that residential extensions should respect the scale, form and materials of the host dwelling and be compatible with the surrounding area, and Policy 37 of the Local Plan, which states that development proposals should be designed to a high standard.

Other Matters

9. While the proposed development may provide improved living conditions for the occupants, the identified harm that would in any case result from the proposal would clearly outweigh any benefit in this regard.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR