
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2017

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3163082

Southerly, Warren Road, Hayes, Bromley BR2 7AN

- 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 Robert Cummins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/03274/FULL1, dated 17 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension, part one/two storey side and rear and first floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The agent has clarified that the appellant's name is Mr Robert Cummins and this is reflected in the banner heading above.
3. An application for a similar proposal was dismissed at appeal¹ on 4 May 2016 on the grounds of character and appearance.
4. Reference is made to amended plans which were submitted to the Council. Those plans are not before me and consequently, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the plans which were subject to determination by the Council.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises of a detached two storey dwelling on the northern side of Warren Road. Whilst there are a variety of architectural styles in the area there is, nevertheless, consistency in terms of layout with properties set back from the road with modest front gardens which contributes to the spacious and open feel to the area.
7. The appeal property lies between two detached bungalows of a modest scale with fully hipped roofs. With regards to the previous appeal proposal the Inspector considered that the first-floor hipped roof projections would *'be in*

¹ Appeal reference: APP/G5180/D/16/3143066

fairly close proximity to the adjacent dwellings, resulting in an unacceptable contrast in bulk at this height'. He went on to say that 'such significant enlargement would result in Southerly appearing unacceptably dominant in relation to the appreciably more modest presence of the adjacent bungalows, giving rise to an incongruous and discordant juxtaposition of scale and bulk'.

8. The first floor extension to the front has been reduced by approximately 1.7m to 0.9m in comparison to the previous proposal. In addition, the line of the first floor projection coincides with the front wall of Pax to the west. Consequently, I consider that the appeal proposal would not appear unduly dominant in relation to the adjacent bungalow, Pax.
9. However, notwithstanding the proposed set back, the proposal would result in a significant extension to the side at first floor level towards Howards, the bungalow to the east. There is currently a considerable gap at first floor level between the appeal property and Howards which allows for views over the existing single-storey garage to the trees to the rear which contributes to the spacious character of the area. The proposed extension would result in an unacceptable contrast in bulk at first floor level and would appear dominant in relation to the adjacent bungalow, Howards.
10. Taking these factors in combination, I consider that the proposal would be an incongruous addition at odds with the spacious character of the area. Consequently, I do not consider that the proposal has altered sufficiently to reach a different conclusion to my colleague.
11. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would, therefore, be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006 which expects all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings to be of a high standard of design and layout. Furthermore, conflict would arise with Policy H8 of the UDP which requires the scale, form and materials of proposals for the alteration or enlargement of residential properties to respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated and taking all other considerations into account, the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector