



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 DECEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3295675

165 Kingsway, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1PP

- 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 Ms Lisa Wendleken against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/05325/FULL6, dated 8 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is part one/two storey side and rear extension and loft conversion comprising rear dormer and roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was submitted to the Council in the name of Ms Lisa Wendeline. The correct spelling of the appellant's surname has been confirmed in writing as being Wendleken.
3. The description of development on the application form is "*ground floor rear, first floor part-rear & part side and roof dormer*". I have amended this to the description used in the Council's decision notice and on the submitted appeal form, which is more precise.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The site is located in the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). The London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (January 2019) (the Local Plan) summarises the special and distinctive qualities of the ASRC, which include, amongst other things, the regularity of front and rear building lines, the consistency in front roof lines and the symmetry between pairs of houses.
6. Numerous alterations have been made to the appeal property and to adjoining No.163 Kingsway. However, these previous alterations, due to their modest scale, do not harmfully unbalance the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses or detract from the character of the wider area.
7. Elsewhere along Kingsway there are detached and semi-detached houses of varying design and appearance. Extensions tend to be to the rear, albeit I did

notice some hip roof alterations and side dormers. Where side extensions do exist, these are generally either single storey or significantly set back from the front elevation, retaining the sense of symmetry visible along the front building line and in the street scene.

8. Although the proposed side extension would be of hipped roof design to match that of the original dwelling, due to its very limited set back from the original front elevation and roof slope, it would be visually prominent in the street scene. This together with the replacement of the original porch canopy with a gable projecting porch and lean to roof across the front of the single storey part of the side extension, would erode the symmetry of the pair of houses, which is a positive characteristic of the area.
9. To the rear, the proposed two storey projection, due to its gable rather than hipped roof, and the dormer, due to its excessive scale, would appear bulky and would fail to respect the original form of the dwelling. Whilst I recognise that these elements have limited visibility from public places, this does not negate the need to comply with planning policies requiring high standards of design.
10. I have had regard to Policy 8 of the Local Plan, which states that the Council will 'normally' require extensions of two or more storeys in height, to retain a minimum one metre space from the side boundary. However, the term 'normally' provides a degree of flexibility, and in this particular case, due to the side boundary being adjacent to a long rear garden, the absence of a one metre gap would not result in a cramped appearance, a terracing effect or have an adverse effect upon the spatial standards of the area. As the proposal would not conflict with the overall aims and intentions of Policy 8, the absence of a one metre gap from the boundary has had little bearing on my decision.
11. In conclusion, the overall scale, form and design of the proposal, combined with the loss of symmetry, fails to respect the traditional character of the original pair of semi-detached dwellings or the Petts Wood ASRC. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Local Plan, which seek amongst other things to ensure that extensions are of a scale, form and design which respects or complements the host dwelling and surrounding properties, that respects, enhances and strengthens the special and distinctive qualities of the ASRC's and that dormer windows are of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape.

Other Matters

12. As I am not dismissing the appeal on the absence of a one metre space between the extension and the boundary, the planning permission referred to me by the appellant is of little relevance. I have determined this appeal on its own merits, having regard to the character and appearance of the existing pair of semi-detached houses and their immediate surroundings.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR