

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 5 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/17/3170617

1 Walnuts Road, Orpington, London BR6 0RG

- 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 Donald Doyle against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/03949/FULL1, dated 19 August 2016 was refused by notice dated 3 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new build house to side of the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, and on the living conditions of future occupiers of the dwelling with particular regard to the provision of internal living space.

Reasons

3. The development would be located on a side corner plot alongside an existing row of terraces in a residential development of streets of similar dwellings. The terraces at Walnuts Road are situated on a rise and are largely double fronted with correspondingly sized gardens. The proposed overall design, two storey front, single storey rear projection and hipped roof would be detailed to blend with the existing dwelling. However, because of its unusual prominence on the rise with open land to the rear and on a corner plot, the development would be readily visible.
 4. Furthermore due to the plot constraints this would be a single fronted dwelling with a small rear plot. It would appear narrower and at odds with the larger double fronted dwellings and more spacious gardens nearby. It would not complement the existing dwellings and would appear incongruous in the streetscene as a result.
 5. Moreover although there would largely be a 1m separation at the boundary, the development would occupy almost the whole of the side plot, and closely abut the boundary fence. This would be cramped in comparison to the larger side plots adjoining the roadside and good sized gardens in the area and be uncharacteristic of the prevailing pattern of development. This would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
-

6. This combination of factors leads me to conclude that this would result in development that would conflict with Policy BE1, H7 and H9 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) because these seek amongst other things to ensure high quality development and adequate separation on corner plots. It would also conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan because the development would not take account of the form, structure and scale of the existing spaces, streetscene and surrounding buildings.
7. Turning to the second issue, and acknowledging the plot and design constraints, the resulting bedrooms would be too small without adequate room space for a family sized dwelling. They would be cramped and would provide insufficient space to allow for reasonable circulation and everyday living needs. That is borne out by the fact that they would not provide space per bedroom of 7.5msq for the single bedroom and 11.5msq for the double bedroom which is required by the DCLG Technical Housing Standards 2015. As a result the single bedroom would be too small in width and room space and the double bedroom would not provide enough room space overall. This would be harmful to occupiers of the dwelling and would not secure a high quality layout that would respect and ensure living conditions for future occupiers of the development.
8. I conclude that this would consequently have a detrimental impact that would conflict with the DCLG Technical Housing Standards 2015 and Policy BE1 of the UDP and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan. The latter sets out Gross Internal Area space standards for a two bed dwelling which the proposal would satisfy- however, it also provides for room layouts and spaces so that it would conflict with it with regard to providing adequately sized rooms and efficient room layouts, and conflict with the Mayors Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016 with regard to high quality space overall.

Other Matters

9. Paragraphs 58 and 69 of the Framework refer to achieving high quality development that contributes to placemaking and to creating communities. This development would not comply with these policies overall for the reasons above, and these factors outweigh the contribution that the development might otherwise make in terms of providing new housing.
10. Other appeal decisions have been referred to, however I am not aware of all the evidence pertaining to those decisions or their particular circumstances. Nevertheless I note that appeal ref: 3133851 is out of the area and considered under different planning policies, and another appeal ref: 3152688 deals with a replacement dwelling on a large detached plot, so that these do not appear directly similar to this case. Appeal ref: 3018534 does refer to an end of terrace development, however in that situation the dwellings were set back from one another in a different configuration and there was no issue raised regarding living conditions of future occupants of the development itself. Moreover, each case must be decided upon its own merits in any event.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jones INSPECTOR