



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2022

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3306072

59 Lynwood Grove, Orpington BR6 0BQ

- 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 Ifedayo Adeyemi against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/01288/FULL6, dated 25 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Single Storey Part Rear/Part Side Extension. First Floor Part Rear/Part Side Extension. Loft Conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of The Knoll Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

Reasons

3. Lynwood Grove is predominantly characterised by two-storey detached dwellings of mainly traditional design. Frontages are either open or enclosed by low boundary treatments. While there are variations in roof shapes on Lynwood Grove, there is a prevailing cohesiveness to the scale and general massing of roof forms on this road. The road is flanked by grass verges including mature tree planting and there is a soft landscaped roundabout at its mid-point. Taken together, the high-quality of the architecture, the generous plot sizes and the mature landscaping on Lynwood Grove form an integral part of The Knoll ASRC's special and distinctive qualities.
4. No 59 Lynwood Grove is a two-storey detached dwelling set back from the road with a long rear garden. The front elevation of No 59 has a distinctive asymmetrical roof which incorporates a two-storey gabled front projection with a steeply sloped roof to the side of this. These features ensure that No 59 sits comfortably within the street scene and contributes positively to The Knoll ASRC's high-quality residential environment.
5. The extended gable sided ridgeline, in combination with the flat roofed hips to either side of the front gable, would give the front facing roofscape an unduly bulky appearance. Given the position of the host dwelling slightly forward of the front elevations of the dwellings at Nos 57 and 61 Lynwood Grove, the mass of the extended roof would appear conspicuous in views towards the side

of the dwelling for anyone approaching the site from either direction on Lynwood Grove.

6. In addition, the loft conversion would result in a large flat roofed gable to the rear elevation. This would unacceptably dominate the roofscape to the rear elevation and from my observations on site, this would be significantly at odds with the massing and scale of the majority of other roof forms within The Knoll ASRC.
7. I acknowledge that the rear elevation would not be visible from public vantage points although it would be noticeable from a number of neighbouring gardens. In any event, this does not overcome my overall design concerns and I do not consider that the lack of public visibility obviates the needs to achieve good design. Indeed, paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the creation of high-quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to the design of other dwellings and extensions that have been approved within The Knoll ASRC. The extensions shown at Nos 10 and 50 Lynwood Grove and the dwellings at Nos 71, 75, and 85 Lynwood Grove and 64 Mayfield Avenue are all hipped towards their first-floor side elevations and there are no flat roofed elements based on the plans and photographs provided. In these respects, I do not find them comparable to the design of the appeal proposal which for the reasons set out would neither complement the host dwelling nor respect the overriding characteristics of the ASRC.
9. The use of a matching white render and cased diamond panelled windows and shutters, whilst common features of The Knoll ASRC, would not mitigate the detracting elements of the proposal's design described above.
10. I conclude the development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of The Knoll ASRC. In that regard, it would conflict with the requirements for development to be of a high standard of design, to complement the host dwelling and to respect, enhance and strengthen the special and distinctive qualities of Areas of Special Residential Character in Policies 6 (Residential Extensions), 37 (General Design of Development) and 44 (Areas of Special Residential Character) of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019). For the same reasons, it would also be contrary to requirements in the Framework for good design which is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of The Knoll ASRC. In that regard, the development would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
12. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR