
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 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/17/3168836

1 Wellhouse Road, Beckenham, BR3 3JR

- 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 Rodney Hall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/05136/FULL6, dated 2 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is part one and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character of the semi-detached pair of dwellings to which the appeal property belongs and on the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is one half of a symmetrical semi-detached pair in a prominent location at the corner of Wellhouse Road and Crossways Road. The pair of dwellings is especially prominent when seen from Crossways Road because it faces almost directly towards anyone travelling up that road in a west to east direction. In addition, its prominence in Wellhouse Road is emphasised by its position next to a substantial area of public open space.
4. The extension would be substantially more than half the width of the original dwelling at first floor level with the result that the existing symmetry of the pair of dwellings would be lost. I recognise that the extension would be set back from the dwelling's existing frontage but this would not overcome the loss of symmetry. In my opinion the extended pair would appear as an unbalanced and uncomfortable element in the street scene. In this context I read the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance No 2. This says that in order to retain architectural unity very large extensions, which overwhelm their host buildings, are unlikely to be acceptable. Because of the appeal property's prominent position the loss of symmetry would be far more noticeable than it would be for a building in a continuous row of dwellings. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would be harmful to the pair of dwellings and to the street scene and would conflict with the objectives of saved policy BE1 in the Council's Unitary Development Plan.

5. The appellant refers to a recently permitted extension at 42 Wellhouse Road. This is an end of terrace property and is not in a prominent corner position. As such the design considerations are significantly different from those in the appeal before me, which I must in any event determine on its own merits.

George Arrowsmith

INSPECTOR