



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 JANUARY 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3293650

7 Lansdowne Avenue, Orpington BR6 8JT

- 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 Robert Taylor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/04616/FULL6, dated 9 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extension, exterior and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, building works had commenced on an alternative development. This has had no bearing on my decision, and I have determined this appeal based upon the plans submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house, which previously had a single storey flat roof garage to the side. Its wide frontage and wide windows, give the building a strong horizontal emphasis. It is set within a spacious plot of land, and due to its position, on the bend of a residential estate road, and its minimal landscaping, its front and side elevations are visually prominent in the street scene.
5. Surrounding properties comprise a mixture of detached houses and bungalows of similar age, materials and detailing, with many having been altered and extended to the front, side and rear. Soft landscaping, open frontages and generous spaces between dwellings, particularly above ground floor level, give the area a very pleasant, open and spacious feel.
6. The proposed development, particularly due to the proportions of the two front gables and the number, size and type of front windows, would not reflect the distinctive characteristics of the existing dwelling or those immediately surrounding it. Moreover, the width of the two-storey side extension would

detract from the space between buildings and would appear incongruous in comparison to adjacent properties.

7. Whilst I have had regard to other similarly large extensions that have been approved and built in the area, these are either in less visually prominent locations, such as in the corner of a cul-de-sac, or are of a design that more closely reflects the style, appearance and fenestration of other dwellings and original features in the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harmfully detract from the appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene, contrary to Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (January 2019), which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that extensions are designed to a high standard that complements the scale and proportions of adjacent buildings and that respects the space between buildings where it contributes to the character of the area. As Policy D3 of The London Plan (March 2021) relates to optimising site capacity, I do not consider it to be relevant to this householder proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no considerations to indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR