



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2024

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/24/3347134

130 Andover Road, Orpington, Bromley, BR6 8BL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Neil Belcher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/23/04221/OUT.
 - The development proposed is demolition of a multi altered detached bungalow and for the construction of a pair of semi detached chalet bungalows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal is in outline, with appearance, layout and scale to be determined at this stage. Matters of access and landscaping are reserved for future consideration. The drawings submitted with the application all relate to the matters under consideration and I shall therefore determine the appeal on the basis of these drawings.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a chalet style house, with front and rear gables and side facing dormers having undergone various alterations and extensions in the past. There is also a detached building to the side. The site is currently well screened by an evergreen hedge along the front boundary and coniferous trees along the western side boundary.
5. The existing dwelling is set within a row of semi-detached, 1930's bungalows. Whilst there are examples of bungalows which have undergone a hip to gable extension, most have retained their original hipped roof profile. In contrast, the opposite side of the road is characterised by two storey, terraced and semi-detached dwellings.
6. The existing chalet style dwelling is of a markedly different design and appearance to the adjacent hipped roof bungalows. It has a higher ridge line than the adjoining dwellings although this is not particularly apparent in the

street scene due to its narrow front gable, with the main ridge running front to back along its length, extending deeper into the site away from the road frontage. The side dormers, whilst not characteristic of this part of Andover Road, are not particularly prominent in the street scene due to the existing screening and the positioning of adjacent dwellings.

7. The proposed semi-detached dwellings would be arranged over two floors and would be of a chalet style, with front and rear dormers. The building would be of a similar height to the existing chalet, however the change in orientation with side gables and a long ridge extending across much of the width of the site would result it in being more prominent in the street scene.
8. I acknowledge that the existing dwelling does not reflect the character and appearance of the adjacent hipped roof bungalows. However, the over dominance of the proposed dwellings would be further compounded by the proposed dormers which would extend across virtually the full width of the semi-detached pair, with only a marginal inset from the flank walls. The continuous front dormer would highly prominent due to its overall width and would further emphasise the two storey height of the dwellings.
9. Furthermore, front facing dormer windows are not particularly characteristic of this part of Andover Road. An exception close to the site is at 138 Andover Road, however this dormer is set within the roofslope of the hipped roof dwelling and is smaller in scale than the proposed front dormer.
10. Overall, I find that the combination of the prominent ridgeline with side gables and the large front dormer across the semi-detached pair would result in an overly dominant and incongruous form of development which would not relate well to the scale, height and hipped roof profile of the adjacent bungalows.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies 4 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021. Collectively, amongst other things, these policies seek to secure development of a high standard of design and layout which positively contributes to the existing street scene and landscape. The proposal would also be contrary to the Bromley Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2023 which amongst other matters, encourages architecture to contribute to the creation of a cohesive built environment with design that compliments surrounding development in terms of its scale, mass and detail.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has provided photographs to show the use of dormer windows and the siting of houses next to bungalows. With regard to the examples in Andover Road, I note the relationship between the two storey terrace opposite the site and the bungalow at 67 Andover Road, however this marked change of character is the reflection of different eras of development. I acknowledge that Andover Road is a long road with stretches that are more mixed in character, resulting in bungalows being sited next to two storey houses. However, none of these examples appear to be directly compatible to the appeal proposal which seeks to introduce a pair of two storey semi-detached houses with a large front dormer into a row of bungalows.

13. With regard to the example of dormer windows in Charterhouse Road, this site is distant from the appeal site and therefore has a different context. Accordingly, it is of little relevance to the appeal proposal. Several of the photographs do not identify where they were taken in Orpington or the wider context and I am therefore unable to assign any significant weight to these examples. In any event, I am required to determine the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR