
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/23/3330995

16 May Avenue, Orpington BR5 2ED

- 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 Henry Nartey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref. DC/23/02752/FULL6, dated 14 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 September 2023.
 - The proposed development is for two storey side, part two storey part single storey rear extensions.
-

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 existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached, two-storey house on May Avenue with off-street parking to the front. The streetscene to this side of the road is domestic in nature with the rear elevations of commercial buildings that front Cray Avenue opposite.
4. It would be evident from May Avenue that the ridge height of the two-storey side element would match that of the existing property. Being flush with the highest point of the dwelling, the addition would lack subservience in this regard. The scheme would be set back from the front elevation of the host property, however this would be minimal and appears as a token gesture; the extension would therefore be neither fully integrated nor clearly subordinate. Overall, the imposing appearance of the extension would be in contrast to the existing residence, and compete with its scale. It would represent a bulky addition to the detriment of the character of the building.
5. I appreciate that alterations to semi-detached properties will inevitably result in an imbalance to an original pair, and with this in mind the principle of extending the property is likely to be acceptable. I note that the proposals would retain a gap of 1 metre to the side boundary, and to my mind the width of the extension would be acceptable and in proportion to the existing house. However, the specific development before me would result in a discordant scheme for the reasons above.

6. I am aware that the development would not have an adverse impact upon the amenities of the occupiers of either of the neighbouring dwellings in terms of privacy, light and overbearing impact, and that the extension would enhance the quality of internal accommodation. However, these matters would not outweigh the harm I have identified previously.
7. I also recognise the presence of other extensions in the vicinity, and observed the relevant properties highlighted in the grounds of appeal at my visit. Nevertheless, additions to other houses would be neutral considerations in any balance against planning harm, and I am mindful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
8. I consider that the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019, which seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other matters advanced, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR