



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: 7th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3279109

19 Broxbourne Road, Orpington BR6 0AZ

- 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 Altan Ramadan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref: DC/21/00747/FULL6 dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations to the front elevation to include new central entrance, right side bay windows ground and first floor to mirror left side and change of fenestration to balance the look of the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council used the same description of development as used by the Appellant at the time of the application submission, as set out above. However, I noted at my site visit that the existing plans and elevations shown on the submitted plans did not match the existing situation on site. The submitted plans and elevations shown to be 'existing' include side and rear extensions and alterations that have not been built.
3. I understand from the Council's officer's report that an appeal decision with the Council's reference 17/05336/FULL6 was granted on appeal for a part one / two storey rear extension and first floor side extension, but I have not been provided with a copy of that decision or the approved plans. It would appear that the appeal decision had the Council's reference No: 18/00114/S78 and was allowed in September 2018.
4. The Appellant's statement provided no additional clarification although a photograph of the existing building was included that confirmed that the submitted plans labelled as 'existing' do not match the existing position.
5. I sought further information and clarification from the parties in respect of the plans and whether the 'existing' referred to the earlier appeal scheme, as though it had been built out, and whether that scheme had been or now could be implemented. Neither the Appellant nor the Council has responded to this request for clarification.

6. On the evidence before me and my own observations at the site visit, I am unable to satisfactorily assess the proposals. Furthermore, I do not consider that I am in a position to determine the appeal in accordance with the development plan, as there is insufficient information before me to ascertain the full extent of the proposed works. Certainly, the description of development does not relate to the extent of proposed works from the existing position, as I saw at my site visit.
7. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal must fail; the submission before me is incomplete and the effect of the proposed changes cannot be fully assessed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR