The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3266713
80 St Paul's Wood Hill, Orpington BR5 2SU

- 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 Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
- The application Ref DC/20/03327/FULL6, dated 26 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 October 2020.
- The development proposed is smooth painted render on all elevations including loft dormers.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey end-of-terrace house. The property is of brick and tile constructions and sits within an area of similar residential properties. The house is located close to a large area of grassed open space which separates the properties from the road. Due to this and the configuration of the properties, the appeal property is highly visible within the area.

4. The property has been the subject of extensions and I have been provided with details of these. The appellants indicate that the use of different bricks and mortar means that the materials do not match and that the proposal would unify the appearance of the property and improve its appearance.

5. I can see that the original property has different bricks and mortar type to that of the extension. It would be unusual to find an exact match for a property such as this particularly where the original bricks would have aged. Notwithstanding that there is some difference visible, and that some other alterations may have taken place, I consider that the bricks are a reasonable match and do not have any negative effects on the appearance of the property. In the longer views of the property that are available, the difference is not apparent.

6. Within the surrounding area, the traditional appearance of brick and tile construction predominates, is characteristic of the area and has a pleasing and unifying effect. There are only very few examples within the wider area where properties have been rendered or pebble-dashed and none which can be seen within the same view as the appeal property.

7. The proposal would be uncharacteristic of the area and would detract from the character and appearance that I have identified. It would disrupt the harmonious appearance of the numerous houses here which are constructed in similar materials and I consider that it would appear out of character. This would be heightened by the prominent position of the house where close and long views of it are available from within the surrounding area.

8. I have specifically looked at the other 2 examples referred to by the appellant. I have not been made aware of the circumstances of these alterations and do not know if they are the result of any permission given by the Council. In addition, I note that the render to no 46 Whitewebbs is only applied to the front elevation and neither example is in a similar position to the appeal property and so both are considerably less widely visible.

9. I consider that the proposal would have a harmful visual effect on the surrounding area and would be at odds with the character of the area. In addition, its effects would be apparent from a relatively wide area due to the location and position of the property. As a result, the proposal is contrary to Policy 37 of the Council's Local Plan 2019. I have taken account of all matters raised by the appellants but find nothing sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR