



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2017

**by David Spencer BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 18 August 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3178728**  
**159 Kings Hall Road, Beckenham BR3 1LL**

- 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 K Bharucha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
  - The application Ref DC/17/01384/FULL6, dated 23 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2017.
  - The development proposed is single and part double storey extension to existing dwelling house.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single and part double storey extension to existing dwelling house at 159 Kings Hall Road, Beckenham BR3 1LL in accordance with the application Ref DC/17/01384/FULL6 dated 23 March 2017 and subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced within 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 1704-100; 1704-101; 1704-200a; 1704-201; and 1704-202.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed part double storey extension on the character and appearance of 159 Kings Hall Road and its surroundings.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of group of two storey semi-detached houses extending from No.159 to No.173 Kings Hall Road. These dwellings are compactly arranged such that there is generally little space between the individual pairs and most follow a similar building line with the exception of Nos.159 and 161 which are set forward slightly. All properties are set back from the public highway behind front gardens such that they are not prominent in the streetscene.
4. In terms of character and appearance No.159 occupies a spacious and open triangular end plot bordering the watercourse to the south. The tapered shape

of the plot at No.159 means it has a wide street frontage appreciably at variance to the other semi-detached dwellings. At ground floor level No.159 has been extended to the side and modestly to the front. Accordingly, the appeal site, as the end dwelling, has a reduced relationship to the pattern and symmetry of the other semi-detached dwellings in the small group.

5. The proposed extension at first floor level would continue the ridgeline and be of a similar depth to the host property. As a consequence the massing of No.159 would appear larger than the other semi-detached properties, particularly its partner at No.161. However, in the context of the atypically spacious plot the extended first floor form would not appear as over-development or particularly unbalancing. The compact arrangement of the semi-detached dwellings in the wider group means that they virtually appear as a continuous form in various perspectives. The proposed extension would modestly extend this form and would largely appear as a consistent lengthening of it at the end of the group.
6. The proposed two storey forward projection would not extend the built footprint beyond the existing front ground floor extension and would have a simple gable roof set subserviently below the main ridgeline. Due to its modest scale and restrained degree of forward projection it would not be particularly prominent in the wider street scene. Whilst there are no front extensions elsewhere in the group of semi-detached dwellings containing No.159, again I consider the unique characteristics of the spacious plot allow for some degree of individuality at this end property without significantly harming the rhythm and symmetry of the modest group of relatively modern semi-detached houses.
7. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of 159 Kings Hall Road and its surroundings. The proposal would conform to the design requirements of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) Policies BE1 and H8 and those of The London Plan 2015<sup>1</sup> at Policies 7.4 and 7.6. I also note that paragraph 4.28 of the UDP in support of Policy H8 does not preclude the principle of forward extensions to semi-detached dwellings and I have found that there are particular circumstances in this case that would allow for this element of the proposal at the appeal location. The appeal proposal would also accord with the objective of the National Planning Policy Framework to secure high quality design.
8. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters before me, I conclude that the appeal should succeed. Other than the standard time limit condition, I consider a condition controlling the external materials and finishes to the extensions necessary in the interests of local character and appearance. I am also imposing a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, which is considered necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

*David Spencer*

Inspector.

---

<sup>1</sup> The London Plan: The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011 (March 2015)