



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3278311
90 Andover Road, Orpington BR6 8BN

- 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 Shruti Sagar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref: DC/20/05037/FULL6 dated 7 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is to enlarge the existing dwelling by adding a double storey side extension and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development sets out the proposed development together with further information about the proposal. Whilst I have taken all these matters into account, there is no need for me to record this additional information in the description of development. The Council described the application as a part one/ part two storey side and rear extension and associated roof alterations to include hip to gable extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, semi-detached property on the east side of Andover Road and on the junction with Cathcart Drive within a predominantly residential area. There are a mix of both houses and bungalows within the locality, with semi-detached houses, including the appeal property, on the east side of the road either side of the junction with Cathcart Drive, and bungalows on the west side of Andover Road in the vicinity of the junction. The properties on the east side of the road are set at a higher level than the properties on the west side. Although there are a few exceptions, the properties are generally well spaced, with good sized open gaps at first floor level, providing a spacious character and appearance to the local area. The front, side and rear of the appeal property are readily seen in street scene views, as a result of its corner location.

5. The existing property has been extended with a single storey side extension up to the site boundary. The proposal would create a two storey rear and side extension. At ground floor the rear extension would extend up to the side boundary and would be the full width of the house whilst at first floor the side extension would be set in from the side boundary by approximately 1m. The first floor extension would be the same depth at the rear as the ground floor extension but cut back in depth and width adjoining the boundary with the other 'half' of the semi-detached pair.
6. At roof level, the main roof would change from a hipped roof to a gable end; I am advised that a Lawful Development Certificate was granted for a similar roof alteration under the Council's ref: 20/03447/PLUD. The side extension would be partially hipped and set down from the main roof ridge. At the rear, the extension would have a crown roof, set down from the main roof ridge.
7. The single storey side extension already exists and the first floor extension would be set in from the side boundary. Nonetheless, the overall width and depth of the side first floor extension which would merge with the proposed extensions at the rear together with the various roof forms and alterations would all combine to create a very large and bulky property when seen from the front, side and the rear. The scale and massing of the property, as extended, as well as its site coverage, would appear cramped within its plot and out of character with more spacious pattern of development found within the local area. It would become over dominant and visually intrusive in the street scene.
8. I agree with the Appellant that given the corner location there would be no terracing effect from the proposed extensions. However, they would be at odds with and detract from the standards of separation and spacious pattern of development found in the locality.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions, taken together, would harm the character and appearance of the existing property as well as the local area. This would conflict with Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which amongst other things, seek for new development to be of a high quality which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

10. The Appellant has drawn my attention to the extension at No 62 Cathcart Drive where a two storey extension has been built up to the side boundary. I understand that this was granted permission in 2009 under the Council's ref: DC/09/00321/FULL6. Each proposal must be judged on its individual merits and the prominent location of the appeal property and the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the locality are not, in my view, comparable with the property and its siting, as referenced by the Appellant.

Conclusion

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

L J Evans

INSPECTOR