
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/21/3274564

Land adjacent to 107 Lockesley Drive, Orpington BR5 2AB

- 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 Angelo Kyranidis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/05025/FULL1, dated 4 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a detached two storey dwelling with accommodation in the roofspace to accommodate 2x self-contained two-bedroom residential units.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this narrow plot of land which is situated between pairs of semi-detached houses. The site currently accommodates a single garage. The surrounding residential area comprises mainly pairs of semi-detached, 2 storey houses of a similar design.
5. The proposal seeks permission for a 2 storey building with accommodation within the roof-space, to provide 2 flats. The building would be built up to the side plot boundaries and would have a hipped roof.
6. Within the area the strong prevailing character is of semi-detached houses which have gaps at the sides between the plot boundaries and pairs of houses. In many instances the houses have a single storey element at the side which occupies part of the gap. However, these are mainly set well back from the building frontage and, as they are only single storey, they have little effect on the characteristic spacing between the properties and the impression is of the houses being set off the common boundaries at the sides. Whilst the

neighbouring property at No 109 has a wide gap between the main 2 storey wall of the house and its boundary with the site, No 107 on the other side has a gap similar to many others in the area.

7. The uncharacteristically narrow plot, combined with a 2 storey building which would be sited on both side boundaries would result in a building that would appear unacceptably cramped within its confined site. There would be no setting space between the building and its side boundary which would be uncharacteristic of the area. Notwithstanding that the overall height of the building would be less than its neighbours, I consider that it would have a considerably detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. I appreciate that there would be a reasonable gap provided between the proposed building and the main structure at No 109, but the unacceptable relationship of the proposed building and its own confined plot would remain. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with Policies 4, 8 and 37 of the Council's Local Plan
8. The Council indicates that it is unable to demonstrate a suitable supply of housing sites. Within this context, I acknowledge that the proposal would make a contribution to the supply of new homes within the area. However, I find that the harm that I have identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits arising from the proposal.

Conclusion

9. I have taken account of all of the submissions made in relation to this appeal, including the revisions made after the Council refused a similar scheme (Council's Re: 20/02110/FULL1). In light of these, I have concluded that the proposal would give rise to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and this harm is not outweighed by any benefits. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR