



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3330927

15 Ladywood Avenue, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1QJ

- 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 L Hughes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref. DC/23/01039/FULL6, dated 15 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2023.
 - The proposed development is for part single storey / part first floor front / side extensions, additional rooflights to side roofslopes and external insulation on existing side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for part single storey / part first floor front / side extensions, additional rooflights to side roofslopes and external insulation on existing side extension at 15 Ladywood Avenue, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1QJ in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. DC/23/01039/FULL6, dated 15 March 2023, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2023 16 Rev A
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development having regard to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounds, including the Chislehurst Road, Petts Wood Conservation Area (CA) and the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a two-storey, detached house with off-street parking on the driveway to the front. The local neighbourhood is residential in nature with Petts Wood station, shops and other facilities a short walk away in a broadly westerly direction.

4. Being situated in the CA, special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area, as required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Paragraph 199 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
5. The special architectural and historic interest of the CA derives from the garden suburb principle. It has a highly ordered and regular appearance despite the variety of architectural design and detail. Lawns, shrubs, low hedges and trees are evident in generous gardens to the front and rear of the houses. The Petts Wood Historic Area Assessment outlines that Ladywood Avenue itself is a mixture of detached and semi-detached neo-Tudor houses with dominant heavy timbers. The render is very rough and distinctively wavy, with deep eaves and prominent rafter ends and lattice windows which all contribute to the rustic character. These observations are generally consistent with the detailed discussion about the ASRC contained within Appendix 10.6 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (LP).
6. At my site visit I observed other front extensions at first floor level that have already altered the appearance of dwellings within the street scape. Whilst these may have been approved prior to the designation of the CA or the ASRC or the adoption of the LP, they are nevertheless established features within the locale and to my mind do not result in harm to local character. Within this context I consider that the first floor extension would not appear incongruous.
7. The element would be of small scale and subservient, set against the backdrop of the host building. It would lie below the main ridgeline and be set back from the front elevation. To my mind, it would visually connect with the overall appearance of the property, without being imposing or dominant. I am therefore of the view that the scheme would not detract from the character of the existing dwelling itself.
8. The Council does not appear to object to the single storey front extension to the garage and I have no reason to disagree. It would harmonise with the residence in terms of its size and design.
9. Taken in the round, I am of the view that the proposal would not adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounds, including the CA and the ASRC. It would meet Policies 6, 37, 41 and 44 of the LP and the CA Supplementary Planning Guidance, which cumulatively seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance, to preserve or enhance conservation areas, and require development to respect, enhance and strengthen the special and distinctive qualities of the ASRC.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match those on the existing dwelling would provide for a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

11. Given the foregoing arguments, I allow the appeal.

C Hall

INSPECTOR