

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2016

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3160602

12 Waldegrave Road, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2JP

- 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 Lisa Meers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02787/FULL6, dated 9 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension to front and side elevations to align with the building line of adjacent properties. Forming new openings and installation of bi-folding doors to rear elevation. Installation of roof windows to side roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the streetscene and the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large detached chalet style bungalow which is situated within a primarily residential area. The dwellings fronting Waldegrave Road and within the surrounding area are a mix of styles and designs with no overall consistency of character or appearance. The dwellings at Nos. 15A, 15B and 16A possess single storey garages that project forward of their front elevations. However, from what could be observed during the site visit, these garages were part of the dwellings' original design rather than being later additions.
 4. Although there is no consistency of design, the streetscene is characterised by the properties being set back from the footways to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and used for parking. By reason of the front gardens, the street trees and the gaps between dwellings, the streetscene possesses a verdant and spacious appearance.
 5. The proposed development includes the erection of a single storey front extension which would project into the property's mainly surfaced front garden. The front elevation of the proposed extension would align with the siting of the front elevations of Nos. 10 and 14. By reason of its subservient scale, siting
-

and the relationship with No. 14, the front elevation of the appeal scheme would not project so far forward so as to be an unduly prominent feature within the streetscene.

6. The flank wall of the appeal scheme would be located immediately adjacent to the shared boundary with No. 14. Although part of the host property's flank wall is already sited close to the boundary, when viewed from the road there is still the perception of a modest gap between the property and No. 14. This assessment applies notwithstanding there is a timber gate providing access to a store.
7. When viewed from the road there would be both actual and perceived loss of the existing gap between the enlarged property and No. 14. Accordingly, there would be an adverse effect on the spacious character and appearance of the streetscene which would be accentuated by the projection of the proposed extension into the front garden.
8. On its own the loss of the gap would not be a sufficient reason for this appeal to fail. However, the design of the proposed extension, especially the width of the opening and the gable rather than hipped roof form, would be unsympathetic to the character and appearance of the property. When the failure to respect the existing character of the host property and the loss of the gap are considered together then these matters would amount to significant harm. The use of matching external materials would not sufficiently address this harm.
9. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and the host property and, as such, it would conflict with Policies BE1 and H8 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan. Amongst other matters these policies require development proposals, including extensions, not to detract from the existing streetscene and to respect or complement the host buildings. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core principle of securing high quality design. Accordingly, and taking into account all other matters including the Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR