

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3281252

68 Grove Park Road, Mottingham, London, SE9 4QB

- 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 Milan Kanabar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/01527/FULL1, dated 22 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is part demolition of existing house and construction of extensions to front, side and rear; raised patio area, front boundary walls and gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. I saw at my site visit that properties in the area vary in appearance and scale, with many evidently having been altered and extended over the years. However, houses remain in scale with their plots, with each other and the wider area: in general, they appear as two storey houses of appropriate height, depth and width as viewed along the road. In particular, the roofs to houses are generally pitched and not of great bulk or depth. As a consequence of these features the road retains its appearance as an attractive, spacious residential thoroughfare with inter-War houses fronting it.
 4. The proposed extensions to No. 68 would see a significant re-modelling of the house and extensions to the building. The side extension would increase the width of the house, which would be combined with extensions and alterations to the roof to create a new crown roof structure over the house. The front elevation of the property would be altered as part of these works to create a new central gable rising to the roof, with two dormers in the new second floor.
 5. This work would substantially change the appearance of the house from a modest dwelling, generally reflective of the character of the area, to a very substantial double-fronted house of an appearance that is not reflected in the character or pattern of housing in the area. The new central gable rising to the roof – and the large scale and depth of that new crown roof – would
-

particularly emphasise the over-dominant size of the addition to the house and the inappropriate remodeling of the building to a form that is incongruous with the host property and the surrounding area. The scale and design of the extensions would thus not appear related to the host property in scale, form or design, and I saw at my site visit that this is a scale of change not seen along the road. The proposed use of render to all the remodeled elevations would reinforce that appearance of over-dominant additions to the house.

6. Policy 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 requires, amongst other matters, all development, including extensions, to be of good architectural quality and complement the scale, proportion, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. Policy 6 of the Local Plan further requires the scale, form and materials of construction of all extensions to respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area. The proposed works would not represent a design that complements or recognises the pattern and appearance of the host property or the residential dwellings within the street scene. The visually over-dominant scale and design of the proposals would thus be harmful to character and appearance and so conflict with the development plan.
7. I acknowledge the appellant's wish to extend their property to provide additional accommodation. However, I must balance this desire against other matters of acknowledged importance as reflected in the policies of the development plan. For the reasons given I consider the conflict with the Local Plan outweighs other considerations and the appeal is dismissed accordingly.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR