

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2017

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) MCD DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3168503
20 Brabourne Rise, Beckenham BR3 6SG

- 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 & Mrs M Pickering against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/05177/FULL6, dated 21 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extension with loft conversion and new roof to side extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The proposed development is described as roof alterations to incorporate rear dormers and front rooflights, part one/two storey side/rear extension, front porch and new pitched roof to existing side extension on the decision notice. This is a more precise description than on the application form and I shall refer to the proposal accordingly.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The elements of the proposal comprising the roof alterations, dormers, rooflights, porch and new pitched roof to the existing side extension are uncontroversial. I therefore consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposed part one/two storey side/rear extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached two storey dwelling but is linked to No 18 Brabourne Rise by a single storey flat roofed extension. On the other side of the house, there is a detached flat roofed garage adjacent to No 22. Both Nos 18 and 22 have two storey side extensions. Whilst there is currently a garage to the side of No 20, the area above it is open and therefore there is a sizeable gap between Nos 20 and 22 at first floor level. The proposal would effectively close much of this gap leaving 1 metre at ground floor level and 2 metres at first floor level.
-

5. The appeal site is within the Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) and UDP¹ Policy H10 establishes that development in an ASRC will be required to respect and complement the established and individual qualities of such areas. Appendix 1 states that the original Edwardian Core of the Park Langley 'garden suburb' is a Conservation Area but the remainder is described as having the character of a garden estate given by the quality of the hedges, walls, fences and front gardens. It is further described as comprising almost exclusively of large detached two storey family houses on generous plots. The appeal site would fall into this description.
6. UDP Policy BE1 requires that the design of new development should not detract from the existing street scene, amongst other things, and Policy H8 states that space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area. Policy H9 indicates that a minimum of 1 metre should be retained from a side boundary but more generous side spaces should be provided in areas where higher standards already exist.
7. In this case there is a generous gap between Nos 20 and 22 and whilst the proposal would retain 1 metre at ground floor level and 2 metres at first floor level this would still close the gap between the properties quite considerably. Although the extension would have a lower ridge height than the existing house, No 20 is at a higher level than No 22 so the impact of reducing the gap is highlighted. Also as both neighbouring houses, Nos 18 and 22 have been extended to the side, reducing the space around No 20, the reduction of the side space as proposed would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of No 20 and the street scene generally.
8. I accept that there are instances of lesser gapes between dwellings in the area and I also note that the appellant has amended a previous scheme to provide a larger gap at first floor level and lowered the ridge height. However, this area has been recognised as one of special residential character and the spatial standards in the area are an important characteristic.
9. I have considered all matters raised including the National Planning Policy Framework² and the previous appeal decisions referred to³ but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed part one/two storey side/rear extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with UDP policies BE1, H8, H9 and H10 and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Bromley Planning Division Unitary Development Plan, July 2006 (UDP).

² Department for Communities and Local Government National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012.

³ APP/G5180/D/16/3153829 & APP/G5180/D/16/3164677.