



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 December 2021 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3282685

227 Orchard Way, Beckenham BR3 3EL

- 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 Martin Kubiak against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/01730/FULL6, dated 8 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is Proposed loft extension to include hip to gable extension and enlargement of existing dormer window to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No. 227 is an extended semi-detached two storey dwelling. It sits within a planned estate comprising of semi-detached properties and intermittent blocks of flats. Properties appear similar in terms of design, form, and materials and a key defining feature is the uniformed and regular rhythm of the distinctive hipped roofs.
5. I observed at one end of Orchard Way the street joins Ambleside Avenue. This street contains rows of terraced properties with several of these having undergone modifications. Given the clear differences between the two-house types, in terms of design, age, form, and materials, I do not consider they form part of the overall character and appearance of this part of Orchard Way.
6. No. 227 along with its adjoining neighbour have been extended at the side with two-storey additions. Despite No. 227 having replaced the original hipped roof of the main dwelling with a gable end, the side addition is set back from the front elevation and down from the original ridge height and features a hipped roof. Given this, the distinctive character and consistent feature of the hipped

roof and the visual symmetry of the pair is retained, thereby making a positive contribution to the street scene.

7. The proposal would see the hipped roof of the side addition replaced with a gable end thus appearing as a bulky, juxtaposed and irregular addition when viewed in relation to the neighbouring property and in the immediate street context. Despite the marginal step-down from the main ridge, the scheme would create a visual imbalance to the pair of semi-detached dwellings, in an area where such additions are not commonplace, particularly to a house of this specific design. The proposal would thereby neither respect or complement the existing character and appearance of the appeal property or the immediate street scene in which it sits.
8. Whilst it is proposed to use similar materials to the original, this factor alone does not override the harm that would arise as a result of its design, form and the unbalanced appearance it would create to the existing pair of semi-detached properties.
9. The proposed extension to the rear dormer has been designed to be proportionate to the modified hip to gable development. In itself, this element of the proposal would not detract from the character of the area as it would not be highly visible from the street. However, its implementation relies on the hip to gable roof extension which is considered to be harmful and it would not be possible to grant permission for one element without the other.
10. I note the example cited by the appellant of a similar development at No. 109 Aylesford Avenue. During my site visit I was able to observe this property and the character and appearance of the streetscape in which it is located. Whilst I consider there are similarities in terms of the development proposed, the character and appearance of the streetscape and the house types are very different. The property located in Aylesford Avenue is an end of terrace property and has a number of different design features to No. 227. Given the very different house types and streets in which they are each located, I do not consider the schemes to be comparable. In any event, each appeal is to be determined on its own individual merits.
11. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. As such I find the scheme is in conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019) which together require the design and layout of proposals for the alteration or enlargement of residential properties to, amongst other things, be of a scale and form that would respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area whilst being imaginative and attractive to look at.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR