



---

# 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: 17 JANUARY 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3299580**

**80 Lynwood Grove, Orpington BR6 0BH**

- 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 Clark against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
  - The application Ref DC/21/03608/FULL6, dated 16 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 April 2022.
  - The development proposed is first floor side extension, elevation alterations including insertion of second floor front window, removal of chimneys, alterations and enlargement of the roof including the installation of two rear dormers and flank rooflights together with conversion of loft into a habitable room.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the application form is "*first floor side and rear extension (wrap around)*". During the course of the planning application process, amended drawings were submitted to the Council and the description of development was amended accordingly. I have used the amended description as this more accurately describes the proposal.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within The Knoll Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). Documents submitted by both parties describe the area as featuring white rendered, quirky and asymmetrically composed houses with steep rooflines and pitched roof front elevations, and where gaps between houses, together with variations in roof shapes and topography create an interesting streetscape. My own observations concur with this description.
5. The appeal property is a detached house set within a spacious corner plot. It has a hipped roof with a front gable projection. It has an existing two-storey side extension, which is stepped back and down from the front elevation and ridge line of the original dwelling. Although this extension has a crown roof, this does not appear obvious from the ground, due to the ridge tiles and roof pitch matching those of the original property and the side elevation being largely screened by the neighbouring property. Other existing extensions and

- alterations to the property are single storey. Consequently, they respect the scale and form of the original dwelling and despite their proximity to the boundary with Melbourne Close, they do not appear overly dominant in the streetscene.
6. The proposed crown roof would run the full width of the dwelling. Due to its steep sides, flat top and the absence of ridge tiles, its appearance would harmfully detract from the original hipped roof form of the dwelling and the positive contribution that it makes to the area. The removal of both chimney stacks would also result in a further loss of character to the dwelling.
  7. Whilst I note that other properties on Lynwood Grove have crown roof extensions, these appear somewhat incongruous. Allowing further alterations of this form would, in my view, further erode the special character of the area, which current planning policies and the ASRC designation seek to preserve. Moreover, due to the prominent corner position of the appeal property, the side and rear elevations, and thus the unsympathetic crown roof, would be far more visible than the other examples I saw in the area.
  8. The proposed first floor side extension would project forward, almost in line with the front gable. Its roof line would be staggered, creating a further flat crown roof with no ridge tiles to the front of the property. It would contain no detail or fenestration, other than a small obscure glazed bathroom window to the side. Although it would not result in a terracing effect, the bulk and mass of the resulting two-storey high wall, together with the steep crown roof slopes, within approximately one metre of the site boundary, would not respect the spatial qualities of the area. Other houses adjacent to Melbourne Close, are set back from the road, including the first floor level of No.82 Lynwood Grove. The proposed side and roof extensions would be over dominant and visually intrusive additions to the Melbourne Close streetscene. It is clear from the supporting text to Policy 8 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (January 2019)(LP), that its purpose includes, amongst other things, protecting spatial standards and visual amenity.
  9. Front, side and rear dormers can be seen on many properties on Lynwood Grove, and small flat roof dormers running through the eaves level are an original feature on several houses in this area, including the appeal property. New pitched roof dormers can also be seen on adjacent properties on the opposite side of Lynwood Grove and Melbourne Close. The dormers proposed would be of modest scale and designed to match the proposed new crown roof form of the main dwelling. However, they would not align with the windows below or the symmetry of the new rear roof slope, resulting in a somewhat unbalanced appearance.
  10. I therefore find that the proposed development would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to policies 6, 8, 37 and 44 of the LP, which seek amongst other things to ensure that new development is of high quality design that respects the form of the host dwelling, the high spatial standards and visual amenity of the area, and the special characteristics of designated ASRC's.

### **Other Matters**

11. The proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of neighbours or to any designated or non-designated heritage assets. There is no evidence to suggest it would not comply with Building Regulations regarding access and energy efficiency, and it would have suitable space for storage of waste. However, compliance with these requirements are neutral factors that do not affect my conclusions on the main issue.
12. I acknowledge the variety of roof forms in the area, the in-principle Government support for upward extensions, and the appellant's desire to create more space within her home. However, I am not convinced by the evidence before me that a similar enlargement of the house could not be achieved in an alternative manner, which better reflects the form and design of the original dwelling and retains more of its original features and character.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that proposal would not accord with the development plan. Thus, having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

*R Bartlett*

INSPECTOR