



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3355887

Logmore, Stanley Road, Orpington, BR6 0ET

- 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 & Mrs Toumi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/03161/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and construction of a single storey side/part rear extension, elevational alterations, and detached replacement cycle store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and construction of a single storey side/part rear extension, elevational alterations, and detached replacement cycle store at Logmore, Stanley Road, Orpington, BR6 0ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/24/03161/FULL6, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three 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: 5938-23-PL401-B.P4; PL402-B.P4; & PL403-B.P4.

Costs

2. An application for costs has been made by the Appellants against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.
-

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is an attractive two-storey, detached home with two street facing gables, an imposing roof and impressive chimneys. It lies on a sizeable plot which is wider to the front than the rear. Alongside is a house of broadly similar form whilst the surrounding area has a mix of styles, age and sizes of homes with gardens which create an area of established residential character and pleasing spacious appearance. The proposal is as described above.
5. The Council is concerned, in summary, that the extension would be too large, prominent and dominant, such that it would impinge upon the qualities of the host property and the streetscene.
6. I would agree with the supposition that this dwelling is of an interesting and attractive appearance which should be protected and that its original form should remain legible and not be obscured. I am not persuaded however that the proposed extension would conflict with this aim. The extension would be single storey, have a minor frontage set-back, be well off the side boundary, have a reasonable distance back from the highway, use a single pitch comparable to the other side of the house, and utilise, in my opinion, suitable glazing. To my mind the key features of the original house, some of which I outline at the start of paragraph 3 above, would continue to appear as the principal aesthetic. The proposed extension would be subservient and would not detract from any immediate or wider viewpoints.
7. In my assessment the proposed development would be well-suited to the character and appearance of this property and its locality; the scheme would represent appropriate design and proportionate scale for this context.
8. Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan are relevant. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they seek well designed development which is architecturally appropriate to a site and its setting and of a suitable scale, appearance and character to protect local distinctiveness. I conclude that the appeal scheme would run not contrary to these policies.

Conditions

9. The scheme should have the standard commencement condition. The Council suggests the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond
INSPECTOR