



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2016

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 June 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3144997

2 Alma Place, Anerley, London SE19 2TB

- 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 Miss Bridget Fahy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/15/05175/FULL6 was refused by notice dated 20 January 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new second floor with mansard roof and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to a new second floor with mansard roof. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to a rear extension and planning permission is granted for a rear extension at 2 Alma Place, Anerley, London SE19 2TB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/15/05175/FULL6, dated 26 November 2015, 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 brick walls of the extension 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: 1575-EX-01 Revision A, 1575-EX-02 Revision A, 1575-EX-03 Revision A, and 1575-EX-04 Revision A, in so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:

the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, wider terrace and the Belvedere Road Conservation Area; and

the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbours, with particular reference to privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990* imposes duties requiring special regard to be had to the desirability: at Section 72(1), of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
5. The appeal site lies within the Belvedere Road Conservation Area. This area is characterised by a mix of buildings of differing designs and sizes. It is primarily residential, with some commercial premises. There is a mix of densely developed terraces and spaciouly laid out detached and semi-detached properties.
6. The appeal premises is a mid-terrace dwelling in a small terrace. This traditional terrace with its distinctive butterfly roof structure makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
7. The proposal includes a second floor extension set back within the butterfly roof form. From my observations, due to the bulk, design and height of this proposed extension, I consider it would add unacceptable bulk at roof level, completely altering the original roof profile. This would appear as a discordant addition to the butterfly roof form of the dwelling and wider terrace, to the detriment of their character and appearance. For these reasons, I consider that the proposed second floor extension would not preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, but this would be less than substantial harm as set out in the Framework.
8. The proposed second floor extension would provide additional living accommodation. This would have only limited wider public benefit. I have attributed considerable importance and weight to the duty and the presumptive desirability of preserving the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which I do not consider, for the reasons stated above, are outweighed by any benefits of the proposed second floor extension. In particular, having regard to the Framework, I find that the harm is not outweighed by any public benefit.
9. For the above reasons, I consider that the proposed second floor extension would be contrary to guidance in the Council's Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) No. 1 General Design Principles; Draft SPG No. 2 Residential Design Guidance (2003); and the Belvedere Road Conservation Area SPG; and saved Policies BE1 and BE11 in the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (July 2006), where they seek new development to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area and complement the existing character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. I consider that the policies referred to above are broadly in accordance with the Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance and that planning should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.

Living Conditions

11. The proposal includes a small balcony area at the rear of the proposed second floor extension. It is clear that mutual overlooking currently occurs between neighbouring properties in this area to a considerable extent, particularly as there are rear terrace open areas at first floor level nearby. Whilst the proposed second floor extension would allow for further overlooking, I do not consider this would materially exacerbate the existing privacy situation. Thus, I do not consider that the proposed second floor extension would materially adversely affect the living conditions of neighbours. Therefore, the proposed second floor extension would be in accordance with saved UDP Policy BE1 and guidance in Draft SPG No 1. General Design Principles and Draft SPG No. 2 Residential Design Guidance in this respect.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the proposed second floor extension would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbours. However, I have found that it would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider terrace and would not preserve the character or appearance of the Belvedere Road Conservation Area. These are sufficient to dismiss the appeal with regard to the proposed second floor extension.
13. I note that a similar proposal for the adjoining property at 1 Alma Close has been the subject of an appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3144534. Although I have reached a similar conclusion, I have determined the proposal before me on its individual merits.

Rear Extension

14. The proposal includes a single-storey rear extension some 2.2 metres in depth. The Council has not raised concern regarding this aspect of the proposal. From my observations, due to the design, scale and position of the proposed rear extension, I do not consider that it would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbours or on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or wider terrace and it would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
15. As this part of the proposal can be undertaken independently from the proposed second floor with mansard roof, I consider it appropriate to issue a split decision in this respect.
16. The Council has suggested the imposition of standard time, matching materials and plans conditions. I consider it reasonable and necessary to impose such conditions, although with regard to a matching materials condition, it is only necessary to impose a condition regarding matching brickwork, as the proposed glazed roof and metal bi-fold doors would not match the existing roof and fenestration materials.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR