
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by Geoff Underwood BA(Hons) PGDip(Urb Cons) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 29 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3157168

17 Windermere Road, West Wickham, BR4 9AP

- 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 Mrs Julie Phillips against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02104/FULL6, dated 29 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension and pitched roof over existing ground floor bay window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension and pitched roof over existing ground floor bay window at 17 Windermere Road, West Wickham, BR4 9AP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/16/02104/FULL6, dated 29 April 2016, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 17WR00 Rev A, 17WR01 Rev A, 17WR02 Rev A, 17WR11 Rev D and 17WR12 Rev E.
 - 3) 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.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council made its decision on amended plans and a revised description of the development proposed was agreed between the main parties. I have determined the appeal on that basis and used the revised description in the heading above and in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is located in an area characterised by predominantly semi-detached houses. Some of these are closely situated to one another and others more generously separated by paired drives. The appeal building has a
-

degree of prominence as a result of its corner location. This provides space between the appeal building and its neighbour, 15 Windermere Road, on the opposite side of Keswick Road. However the two storey flank elevations of both these properties are closer to one another than the distance between the front of houses facing one another on Keswick Road, and the existing single storey side element of No 17 brings them closer still. The footprint of No 17 therefore already sits a significant distance forward of the building line formed by the adjacent pair of semi-detached houses on Keswick Road.

5. This currently results in a degree of enclosure between Nos 15 and 17 and the vertical extension of the existing side element, although noticeable, would not have a significant effect on the level of spaciousness which exists in the vicinity. Any enclosing effect would be further limited as a result of the frontages of Nos 15 and 17 being offset from one another as a result of the angle that properties in the immediate area are situated in relation to Windermere Road.
6. In this context the side extension would only have a limited effect on the openness of the area, the space between dwellings and the streetscene of Keswick or Windermere Roads. Although close to the boundary, due to its situation the resulting extension would not result in a cramped appearance either in the relationship of the resulting building to its plot or the streetscene. Its effects would be further moderated by the hipped roof and lower ridge height giving the extension an element of subservience to the existing house.
7. The resulting extension would be set back from the boundary by 1m (according to the appellant's drawings), which is the minimum distance that London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan, 2006 (UDP) Policy H9 seeks between extensions and side boundaries. Whilst criterion (ii) of that policy acknowledges that higher separation standards may be required on some corner properties, the particular built context of the appeal site means that the spatial standards and visual amenity which currently exists would not be materially harmed and the proposal would therefore not conflict with this policy. For the same reasons it would avoid conflict with the design requirements of UDP Policy BE1 and the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) anticipation of the rejection of poor design at paragraph 64.
8. Although cited in the Council's refusal reason, their Officer Report makes no mention of Supplementary Planning Guidance Nos 1 and 2. I have not been directed to any parts of this guidance with which the proposal would fail to accord and their content is less pertinent to the detailed issues raised by this appeal.

Conditions

9. It is necessary to specify the approved plans, as this gives certainty, and to require that materials match the host building, to preserve the area's character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would not harm the area's character and appearance and would accord with the development plan and the Framework. The appeal is therefore allowed.

Geoff Underwood

INSPECTOR