

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 11 October 2021

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3277101

99 Hayes Road, Bromley, BR2 9AE

- 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 Lucky Turner against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/00864/FULL6, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a proposed double storey side extension and single storey rear extension and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in July 2021. However, as the Framework's policies that are most relevant to this appeal have not materially changed, no parties will have been prejudiced by my having regard to the latest version in reaching my decision.
3. The appeal scheme includes both side and rear extensions, the Council raise no objection to the rear extension. As such, I have focussed my consideration below to the side extension and other alterations.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property comprises a detached, two-storey dwelling with an attached single storey garage to the side. The property is simple and uncomplicated in its design. The surrounding development comprises a mix of both detached and semi-detached properties and there is a variety to the detailed design of buildings, with many being more traditionally detailed than the appeal property.
6. The appeal proposals would result in the addition of a sizeable side extension to the property, with a forward-facing gable element. This would be stepped forward of the main façade of the front elevation and would appear as an overly dominant and assertive addition to the property, with little appearance of subservience. The addition would be at the same height of the existing roof and would result in an elongation of the ridgeline, eliminating the simple

proportions of the dwelling and resulting in an overly large building, with little visual relief from its bulkiness. As a consequence, the resultant dwelling would appear as an incongruous feature within the streetscape at this location, at odds with the attractive scale and form of nearby buildings. That the existing dwelling is more plainly detailed than those nearby does not diminish this harm.

7. I note that the front elevation would also be altered by the addition of raised gable elements over the two main first floor windows. These would be minor additions to the property and would not result in material harm to the dwelling or the surrounding area. The lack of harm in this respect is a neutral consideration.
8. Accordingly, I find that the extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, the proposals conflict with policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan, as well as policy D3 of the London Plan. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that residential extensions are of a scale and form that complements the host dwelling as well as that development positively contributes to the streetscene.

Other Matters

9. I note that the extension is intended to extend a family home and there would be benefits in this respect. Nonetheless, these are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I identify.

Conclusion

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

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR