



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2016

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 08 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3159000

27 Coney Hill Road, West Wickham, Kent, BR4 9BU.

- 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 U. Yildiz against the decision of the Council for the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02122/FULL6, dated 3 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a two-storey side and rear extension, single storey side extension and porch extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be:
 - a) the effect of the proposed development on the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the area; and
 - b) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding properties, in terms of its potential to be detrimental to outlook and appear overbearing, as well as its possible impact on the privacy of the occupiers of number 2 Abbotsbury Road.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 27 Coney Hill Road, is a detached two-storey dwelling, located to the rear of Coney Hill Baptist Church, set back from the road and surrounded by neighbouring properties. Due to its location it does not directly front the street, nevertheless it is open to view, between neighbouring properties, from the public realm.
4. The appellant proposes an extension to the front porch, a single storey side extension and two-storey side and rear extensions including front and rear facing dormers.

Character and appearance

5. The roof to the proposed two-storey side extension would, because of the width of the extension, have a much shallower pitch than the main house and therefore would detract further from the established three dimensional form and

character of number 27. In addition, the proposed ground and first floor windows in this side elevation would not relate one to another, due to their proposed positions, thereby resulting in an uncomfortable relationship between them which would cause further harm. Furthermore, due to the lack of fenestration, modelling or relief generally, this elevation would appear utilitarian, bland and unattractive.

6. Projecting bay style dormers are proposed to both the front and rear elevations. Although not an unattractive feature in themselves, due to the overall width of the dormers and the limited length of eaves in which they would be located, these would appear overly dominant in the overall composition. This would therefore cause further visual harm.
7. The proposed side extension would have a shallow pitched lean-to style roof which, in the context of the three dimensional vernacular form of the existing house, would, in my opinion, appear as an incongruous alien addition that would be detrimental to the architectural integrity of the host property.
8. In itself the proposed enlargement of the porch would appear well mannered. However, the designer has failed to take the opportunity afforded by this proposal to improve the current unfortunate relationship, due to the respective depths, of the projecting porch and the bay window to the lounge. The enlarged porch therefore only serves to exacerbate the existing visual harm.
9. For the reasons set out above I conclude, in respect of the first main issue, that the proposed development would cause material harm to the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (Adopted July 2006) and Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1, *Design in Bromley - General Design Principles* (July 2003) and Supplementary Planning Guidance No 2 *Residential Design Guidance* (July 2003) (SPD) as they relate to the quality of development.

Living conditions

10. The proposed two-storey extension would result in the house being closer to the rear of number 2 Abbotsbury Road. From what I saw on site and due to this built up suburban area I am not persuaded, given the relationship of one dwelling to another, that the house as extended would appear either so dominant or visually intrusive as to cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of number 2 Abbotsbury Road.
11. The new first floor windows to the side and rear elevations of the house, as extended, would afford a degree of overlooking towards number 2 Abbotsbury Road. However, given that the bedroom window is at an oblique angle to number 2 and there would be a reasonable separation distance between the two properties, I do not consider that overlooking leading to a loss of privacy would occur as a result of this window.
12. There would be no direct overlooking from the proposed rear windows and, in any case, the garden of the property is already overlooked to some extent. Nevertheless, the new windows in the rear elevation would, in my opinion, serve to exacerbate the current situation so as to cause harm to the living

conditions of the neighbouring residential occupiers in terms of a loss of privacy. However, as suggested by the appellant, the windows to the bathroom and dressing room could be obscure glazed to overcome this concern. Accordingly, if I were minded to allow the appeal this is a matter that could be addressed by a suitably worded condition.

13.I therefore conclude, in respect of the second main issue, that the proposed development would not appear so dominant as to be visually intrusive to neighbouring residential occupiers or result in overlooking, leading to a loss of privacy. Accordingly, it would accord with UDP Policy BE1 as it relates to the protection of residential living conditions.

Conclusions

14.Having regard to all matters I have concluded that the proposal would not be prejudicial to residential living conditions, but it would cause material harm to the architectural integrity of the host building and thereby the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is not in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR