
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3165054

83 Kings Hall Road, Beckenham, London BR3 1LR

- 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 Jaymeen Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02461/FULL6 was refused by notice dated 23 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear single-storey building and construction of a single-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the demolition of existing rear single-storey building and construction of a single-storey extension at 83 Kings Hall Road, Beckenham, London BR3 1LR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/16/02461/FULL6 dated 21 May 2016 and 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 surfaces of the walls in the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans on drawings: 052_001 Rev P2; 052_005 Rev P2; 052_010 Rev P2; 052_012 Rev P2; 052_022 Rev P2; 052_030 Rev P2; 052_031 Rev P2; and 052_032 Rev P2.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Saved Policies BE1 and H8 in the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006) seek, amongst other matters, for extensions to complement the scale and form of adjacent buildings. I consider these policies are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework
-

- as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.
4. The appeal property is a substantial semi-detached dwelling at the end of a row of dwellings of similar scale and design. A number of these properties have small single-storey rear projections. A three-storey apartment block lies adjacent to the appeal dwelling.
 5. The proposal includes a rear extension projecting approximately 7m and 6.6m in depth from the rear of the two storey section of the main dwelling. There would be a chimney element some 4.5m in height. The proposed extension would have two flat roofs of differing heights with the higher of the two having a height of some 3.9 metres. It would extend to the building line of the rear elevation of the adjacent apartment block. This would be significantly deeper than rear projections on similar properties in this row. Nevertheless, in this position, I do consider that the proposal would appear as a subservient addition to this substantial property.
 6. Although the proposed rear extension would be larger than rear projections on neighbouring properties, I consider that due to the subservient design and siting adjacent to the bulk of the adjacent block of flats, it would respect the existing scale and form of the host dwelling and surrounding development. Set against the bulk of the adjacent apartment block, I do not consider that it would be harmful to the character or appearance of the rear garden environment.
 7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be in accordance with saved Policies BE1 and H8.
 8. The Council has suggested the imposition of standard time and plans conditions, which I consider to be reasonable and necessary. In addition, the Council has suggested a matching materials condition. The proposal includes two flat sedum roofs, which would not match the existing roof. In these circumstances, I consider it reasonable and necessary to impose a condition only specifying the requirement for the external brickwork in the walls to match that of the existing dwelling.
 9. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised, including the effect on the living conditions of neighbours. From my observations, due to the scale and siting of the proposal, I do not consider that it would adversely affect the outlook, privacy or other amenities of neighbours.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR