
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: 06 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3269952
110 Felstead Road, Orpington BR6 9AF

- 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 Gang Guo against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/03661/FULL6, dated 14 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage, erection of two storey rear extension and part single part two storey side extension, insertion of new ground and first floor side windows, erection of timber shed to rear garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposed development as it appears on the submitted appeal form as this appears more accurate and complete than that used on the application form. The Council makes it clear that they only object to the 2 storey side element of the proposal and I shall concentrate on this matter of dispute.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposed 2 storey side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this detached 2 storey house which is located within a residential area of detached and semi-detached houses. The road contains some different styles of houses but these are repeated along its length. The appeal property has a detached garage set to the rear of the house, visible from the street.
5. Policy 8 of the Council's Local Plan 2019 states that for proposals of 2 or more storeys in height, a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site should be retained for the full height and length of the building. The proposed 2 storey side extension would be sited immediately adjacent to the common boundary with No 112 Felstead Road and so would be contrary to Policy 8 and would have a detrimental effect on the space between the dwellings here.

6. The appellant refers to the removal of the existing garage and considers that the proposal would benefit the visual gap between the houses here. The existing garage is detached and set further back than the front of the proposed side extension; additionally, the garage is single storey and not as high as the proposal. I consider that the proposal would reduce the visual gap between the houses.
7. The appellant also submits considerable detail of the other houses on the road and suggests that the proposal would be in keeping or provide better space than many others. I have taken careful account of the submitted details and had the opportunity to view the houses at my site visit. There are many instances where I consider that the space between houses would be greater than would arise from the appeal scheme and so simply disagree with the appellant. Some houses have single storey extensions at the side, adjacent to boundaries and so would comply with Policy 8. Some examples of larger extensions exist but also appear to me 1m or more from boundaries and so, again, would comply with Policy 8. There are examples of houses where such extensions come within 1m of the side boundary. I have no details of the circumstances of these developments, some arising from extensions. However, I am mindful that Policy 8 is contained within the Local Plan which was adopted in 2019 and so it is likely or possible that these examples were not determined under the current Local Plan. In addition, some of the examples that I observed serve to illustrate the detrimental effect that extensions can have on the character of an area as a result in the reduction of space between buildings.

Conclusion

8. I have taken account of all other matters raised in the appeal but find nothing of sufficient weight to add to or alter my conclusion. The proposal would have a harmful effect on the character of the area, contrary to Policy 8 and Policy 37 of the Local Plan and there are no matters sufficient to outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR