



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2023

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3314465

96 Oakdene Road, Orpington, Kent, BR5 2AW.

- 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 Jeremy Cridland against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref: DC/22/01993/FULL6, dated 17 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as *double storey side extension with an open porch to protect the main entrance door on the front elevation, first floor rear extension and loft conversion with the erection of an L shaped box dormer, and demolition of an existing garden shed.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double storey side extension with an open porch to protect the main entrance door on the front elevation, first floor rear extension and loft conversion with the erection of an L shaped box dormer, and demolition of an existing garden shed at 96 Oakdene Road, Orpington, Kent, BR5 2AW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/223/01993/FULL6, dated 17 May 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: BL/DRG/270921/01, 02, 03, and 04.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 96 Oakdene Road is a detached two-storey, inter war house located on the corner of Oakdene Road and Forest Way.

4. The area comprises a mix of large detached two-storey dwellings and smaller semi-detached dwellings of varying architectural styles. Nevertheless, as with number 96 hipped roofs and expressed timber framing are common features of many of the properties. As I observed a number of the surrounding properties have been the subject of alteration and extension and there are also examples of mansard or crown style roofs, including the neighbouring property, 35 Forest Way.
5. The appellant proposes a two-storey side extension with entrance porch canopy, two storey rear extension, loft conversion with an 'L' shaped box dormer and roof lights to the front and side roof slopes.
6. The Council raised no objection to the two-storey rear extension, porch canopy and found the choice of external materials acceptable. From what I have seen and read I would concur with its findings on these matters.
7. As identified above the property is located on a prominent corner plot and therefore any design solution for an extension to the host property should have due regard to the visual transition from one street façade/scene to the next. Furthermore, in this context the three-dimensional form, massing and detail proposed while respecting the design of the neighbouring properties does not, in my judgement, need to slavishly follow that of those which only face the street.
8. The proposed design, while maintaining a hipped roof form to the front elevation has introduced gables to the rear and side elevations. This would be a departure from the established roof form. However, when viewed from Oakdene Road the contrasting gable ended roof of the extension would clearly define this house as the end of this section of development in the road. In this context therefore, I consider that the introduction of a gable end facing Forest Way in contrast to the hipped roof of the street façade would be acceptable. In addition, I consider that the proposal to extend the dwelling closer to Forest Way while helping to address the corner does not result here in creating an unduly excessive addition to the host property.
9. The 'L' shaped box dormer is large. However, it would be set down below the ridge line of the host property, located above the eaves line of the main roof and be set well in from the roof verges. On balance therefore I consider that although large it would not, in this case visually overwhelm the roof.
10. The mansard style roof here would allow, while maintaining the roof pitch of the host property, the new roof to finish below the ridge line of the main house. Thereby, despite its overall size it would be visually subservient to the existing dwelling.
11. Furthermore, the proposed development would alter the form and massing of the original dwelling. However, the design, while retaining the hipped roof to the front elevation would also replicate many of design details found in the host property, roof pitch, expressed timber framing, fenestration proportions, matching materials etc.
12. For all these reasons I conclude in respect of the main issue that, while the proposed extension would be relatively large in the context of the host property, due to the overall design and its corner plot location it would nevertheless appear as well-mannered development in this location, one that

would not unduly impact on the architectural integrity of the host property or the wider street scene. It would therefore accord with the objectives of Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Development Framework– Local Plan (Adopted January 2019) as they seek to secure, along with other things, high-quality imaginative and attractive design that is compatible with surrounding development.

Conditions

13. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building.
14. In the interests of certainty, I shall also impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR