



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2024 by E Street BSc (Hons)

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3347354

7 Daleside Close, Orpington, Bromley BR6 6ED

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Rich against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/00969/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed front covered front porch and part double storey side extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. I have taken the above description from the application form but note from the evidence that the scheme comprises development referred to as a part one/two storey side/rear extension with two dormers to front. I have taken this into account in my recommendation. The main issue for which is the effect of the part one/two storey side/rear extension and two dormers on the character and appearance of the area. This is since the Council do not object to the porch and I have no compelling reason to disagree.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a mostly unaltered semi-detached house with a distinctive plain catslide roof. Due to the land sloping downwards to the west, the unit sits higher than its immediate neighbours. The primary building type within the cul-de-sac are semi-detached dwellings with largely plain front roof slopes. A few of the neighbouring dwellings have been previously extended with subordinate side extensions. This lends to a pleasant originality and honest simplicity to the street scene which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The two storey-side extension would mirror the existing property in height and length. This lack of subordination would dominate and detract from the modesty of the appeal building and characterful roof formation. Additionally, and due to the land level changes, it would appear higher than the appeal unit

on approach from the lower ground level and thus have a prominent position on the street scene. Resultantly, the extension would block views of the original dwellinghouse especially from the east. The wider street scene features subordinate extensions with which this would not harmonise. The dormer windows, due to their flat roof, scale, number and deployment on the frontage, would further erode the quality of the catslide. Their introduction would also be alien to the wider street scene, detrimentally affecting its originality. Consequently, the proposal would not make a positive contribution to the dwelling or the wider street scene.

6. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 and Policy D3 of The London Plan 2021 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matters

7. I understand that the hallway needs to be relocated which appears to be largely an internal re arrangement and I share the Council's views on the proposed porch. I am also informed of a future need for a ground floor bedroom to house a disabled resident. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty set out under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. I am aware that disability is a protected characteristic thereunder.
8. The evidence does not suggest that the need for the adaptations is solely reliant on the scheme as a whole and, specifically, those elements that would cause the harm I have found. In this instance therefore, the harm afforded to the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the area is not outweighed by the benefits in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of disability. Dismissal of the appeal is thus a fair and proportionate approach in this particular case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would not comply with the development plan by virtue of the above harm. I would ascribe this substantial weight. I have had regard to the other material considerations present and conclude that, in this particular case, they would not be sufficient to lead me to recommend allowing the appeal. It should therefore be dismissed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR