
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2017

by **R J Maile BSc FRICS**

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

Decision date: 23 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3177541
60 Manor Way, Beckenham, Kent, BR3 3LJ.

- 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 B and Mrs L O'Brien against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref: DC/17/00678/FULL6, dated 14 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is side and rear two storey extensions with additional accommodation within modified roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side and rear two storey extensions with additional accommodation within modified roof at 60 Manor Way, Beckenham, Kent, BR3 3LJ, in accordance with the terms of the application ref: DC/17/00678/FULL6, dated 14 February 2017, 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 development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Drawing no. MW-892-PD-01:	Location Plan – scale 1:1250; Site Plan – scale 1:200.
- [unnumbered] -	Existing Floor Plans and Elevations (Offset Architects) – scale 1:100.
Drawing no. MW-892-PD-04:	Proposed Floor Plans – scale 1:100.
Drawing no. MW-892-PD-04:	Proposed Elevations – scale 1:100.
Drawing no. MW-892-PD-06:	Existing and Proposed Floor Plans showing retained walls – scale 1:100.
-

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the Manor Way, Beckenham Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. 60 Manor Way comprises a substantial two storey detached dwelling built in the Arts and Crafts style during the inter-war period. It is of brick construction with rendered elevations under a pitched and tiled roof. Both the appeal site and surrounding area, which comprises detached houses, are within the Manor Way, Beckenham Conservation Area.
4. Manor Way is described in the Council's SPG¹ as comprising individual detached houses with common references to neo-vernacular design and materials. Many of the dwellings have been extended, including a number close to the appeal site. These were noted during my site visit.
5. Given the location of no. 60 within a Conservation Area I have considered the development by reference to the statutory duty imposed upon me by virtue of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
6. I have also had regard to national policy as set out at Chapter 12 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) of the Framework² and to the relevant policies of the Development Plan, which in this instance include "saved" Policy BE11 of the Local Plan³ and Policy 7.8 of The London Plan. "Saved" Policy BE11 sets out three criteria for development within Conservation Areas.
7. The Manor Way, Beckenham Conservation Area represents an important heritage asset. As such, paragraph 132 of the Framework requires me to give great weight to its conservation.
8. I note that a similar proposal was the subject of a recent unsuccessful appeal dated 15 December 2016 (ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3160874). Copies of the Inspector's decision and of the submitted drawings have been provided to me.
9. Planning permission was granted by the Council in February 2014 for a scheme comprising roof and elevational alterations to provide habitable accommodation within the roof space, together with single storey side and rear extensions. That permission has apparently lapsed. It nevertheless supports the principle contained within the Council's SPG for Manor Way that there is considerable scope for the addition of sensitively designed extensions, the rear elevation being the preferred location for such additions (see paragraph 3.19).
10. The Inspector's reasons for dismissing the previous appeal are cogently set out at paragraphs 7-10 of his decision letter. The proposals before me have sought to address those concerns.
11. Importantly, the front elevation will remain largely unaltered. The scheme also retains symmetrical gable features on the rear elevation with the large, box-like

¹ Supplementary Planning Guidance for Manor Way Conservation Area, Beckenham.

² The National Planning Policy Framework.

³ The London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan: July 2006.

single storey structure of the previous scheme deleted. The roof alterations have been reduced with a much simplified roof design to the rear, whilst the fenestration now reflects that of the host dwelling.

12. The property is not listed. I noted that the fabric of the building, which includes rendered walls, some Crittal and some simple timber leaded light windows, is of no particular architectural merit.
13. Many of the dwellings within the Conservation Area have been the subject of alterations, including two storey extensions. I have also noted the use of lead covered crown roofs to facilitate loft conversions next door at no. 58 and at no. 27 opposite. The Council's concern regarding the use of such a feature is therefore unjustified and I am satisfied that in the particular circumstances of this case the crown roof would not appear out of character or dominant within the Conservation Area.
14. For all of these reasons I conclude that the scheme before me, which has been well designed, will conserve the character and appearance of the Manor Way, Beckenham Conservation Area. As such, I have found upon the main issue that development as proposed would accord with the requirements of national policy at Chapter 12 of the Framework, Policy 7.8 of The London Plan, "saved" Policies BE1, BE11 and H8 of the UDP and the Council's adopted SPG.

Conditions

15. The Council has put forward a total of three conditions should I be minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by the Government's Planning Practice Guidance issued on 6 March 2014 and find all to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. My reasons for the conditions are:
16. Condition 1 is the standard commencement condition imposed in accordance with section 91(1) (a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Condition 2 will ensure a satisfactory appearance to the completed development in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.
17. Condition 3, which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, provides certainty.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR