
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2017

by George Arrowsmith BA, MCD, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3167510

3c Norheads Lane, Biggin Hill, Wsterham, TN16 3XT

- 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 S Bates against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/05174/FULL6, dated 10 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is part one/part two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on, i) the amenity of the neighbouring residential property at 3b Norheads Lane and, ii) the character of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of four closely spaced detached houses of similar design, which are set back from Norheads Lane behind open plan frontages. At present the house has a forward projecting flat-roofed garage on the side nearest to its neighbour No 3b. This has no significantly adverse effect on the outlook from 3b because that house also has a forward projecting garage on the side nearest to No 3c. There is a first floor window at this side of No 3b but it looks out over the garage roofs.
4. The appeal proposal includes replacing the existing garage at No 3c with a two storey extension which would project 5m beyond the house's main front elevation. The blank side wall of this extension would project well beyond the nearby first floor window at 3b. Whereas the existing garage does not restrict the view from this window, the new side wall would seriously reduce its outlook to an extent which I consider would conflict with the objectives of saved policy BE1 in the Council's Unitary Development Plan (UDP).
5. The two storey extension would make the appeal property appear significantly different from its neighbours. As such it would unbalance what is at present a harmonious group of four houses. In assessing the impact of the difference I am aware that the houses are set well back from the road frontage and form part of a street scene which has a varied visual character. There would

nevertheless be some harm to the street scene and to the objectives of saved UPD policies BE1 and H8. This harm reinforces my conclusion that the proposal is unacceptable.

6. I have noted the specific examples of forward projecting gables cited by the appellant. None of these are identical to the appeal proposal, which I must in any event assess on its own merits.

George Arrowsmith

INSPECTOR