
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2020

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/20/3248515

6 Priorsford Avenue, Orpington BR5 2EW

- 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 Pavelas Susinskis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/02463/FULL1, dated 9 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of porch and garage. Subdivision of plot and erection of attached two storey dwelling; incorporating single storey rear extension and front porch. Formation of highway access on to Priorsford Avenue and widened access on to Sidmouth Road along with car parking, cycle store and bin storage for each dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. When on my site visit, I observed that some works were already underway at the appeal site which may or may not have been connected to the proposal. Notwithstanding these works being underway, I have considered the appeal based on the plans originally submitted to and considered by the Council, which form the basis of the scheme that is before me.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located at the end of Priorsford Avenue on a corner plot at its junction with Sidmouth Road. It has an L-shaped front/side garden facing the junction which stretches round the building to join with the generous back garden. As a result, there is a sizeable gap between its side elevation and the site boundary facing Sidmouth Road. The other properties on Priorsford Avenue are all semi-detached two storey dwellings of a similar type to the appeal property.
5. As Priorsford Avenue is a cul-de-sac, the property directly opposite the appeal site is also located on a corner plot having a similar L-shaped front/side garden and large gap between its side elevation and its site boundary facing Sidmouth Road. The surrounding area is predominately residential mainly comprising two

storey properties of varying types with front and back gardens. The size of the dwellings, their proportionate relationships with their respective plots and the large rear gardens together form part of an orderly and regular pattern of development which contributes to the area's suburban character.

6. The proposal would increase the scale, height, massing and built form of the appeal property and almost entirely infill the gap between its side elevation and the site boundary facing Sidmouth Road. Consequently, while I acknowledge that the proposal would not create a significant terracing effect, I consider that it would give an unbalanced appearance to the pair of demi-detached dwellings that the appeal property belongs, nonetheless. As a result, I also consider that it would also be a discordant addition to the street scene thereby having a significant adverse visual impact.
7. Furthermore, the proposal's disproportionate relationship to its corner plot and the fact that there would no longer be a sizeable gap between the building's side elevation and the site boundary facing Sidmouth Road, means that it would be a cramped form of development at odds with the area's prevailing pattern and suburban character.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would fail to meet the requirements of Policies 8 and 37 of the adopted Bromley Local Plan 2019.

Other Matter

9. I acknowledge that the proposed development would potentially provide an additional dwelling and a social benefit and that there would also be some economic investment from both its construction and subsequent occupation. However, given the small scale of the proposal these benefits would be limited and so are not of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

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

C Coyne

INSPECTOR