



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2022

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3300630

42 Crossway, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1PE

- 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 Adam Baskett against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/00390/FULL6, dated 25 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey front bay window and dormer style window, two storey side and rear extension and elevational alterations.
-

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 appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Procedural Matters

3. As the description of the proposed development varies between the documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the more full and accurate description used by the appellant for their appeal statement.
4. My consideration of this appeal has been carried out with reference to the revised drawings submitted by the applicant during the consideration of the planning application by the Council and prior to their decision.

Reasons

5. 42 Crossways is a two storey detached dwelling with a hipped mansard roof. It is prominently located on a substantial corner plot at the junction of Crossway with Birchwood Road, with a wrap-around garden and a detached garage. It is located in an area of similarly scaled detached and semi-detached houses on relatively large plots, in a residential area with the character and layout of a garden suburb.
6. The local area is verdant in character, with dwellings set well back from the street, albeit they appear to be more closely positioned to the party boundary between dwellings. With the appeal site being a corner plot, the appeal dwelling is set well back from both streets to which it has a frontage. The local

area forms part of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (the ARSC) that is recognised for the significance of its garden suburb design and spatial characteristics.

7. The proposed front extension would alter the appearance of the existing dwelling and would result in it appearing as a hipped roofed house with a twin gable and bay. Although a significant alteration, this part of the proposal would not be out of keeping with the design of the many similar houses in the local area and the ARSC. However, this would be combined with a larger proposed hipped roof two storey side extension with expressed chimney. This proposed side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the proposed front extension but would project beyond the dwellings existing main rear elevation.
8. The proposed scale of the side extension would significantly alter the existing symmetrical balance of the appeal dwelling, as well as the balance of the dwelling on its appeal lot with regard to the distances to the highway boundaries. When combined with the proposed front and rear extension, roof alterations and dormer windows, the proposal as a whole, despite using matching and complementary materials in its construction, would appear to dominate the host dwelling failing to appear as subservient additions.
9. This would significantly alter its design and visual balance and would appear as incongruous in relation to its existing design and scale. Further, the unbalanced and dominating design of the proposal would be apparent in wider views of the appeal property and would not reflect the quality of design seen in the houses in the local area or the ASRC.
10. The proposed two storey side extension would be approximately 4 Metres wide and would result in the flank wall being positioned approximately 3 Metres from the boundary of the appeal site with Birchwood Road. This would be significantly nearer to the highway boundary than other houses on Birchwood Road. Notwithstanding the location of the appeal dwelling on a corner plot, the proximity of the proposed side extension would not reflect the existing building line along this street, where houses are set back significantly from their boundary of the highway.
11. The proposal would, therefore, result in the appeal dwelling appearing as unduly prominent and intrusive in street views. This would have the effect of the appeal property appearing incongruous within the context of the local characteristic of houses being set away from the street and would not, therefore, reflect the generous spacing and spatial characteristics of the local area or that of the ASRC.
12. The appellant has drawn my attention to other approved extensions to dwellings in the local area. The design and context of these vary from the proposal and would have been considered on their own individual merits and I have done likewise in my consideration of the proposal, which is a key tenet of the planning system. I have, therefore, only afforded these little weight in my considerations.
13. For these reasons, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, that of the local area and the characteristics of the ASRC. This would be in conflict with policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and

section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design, integrate with the local area and respect, enhance, and strengthen the special and distinctive qualities of Areas of Special Residential Character.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR