

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2017

by M Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3179943

33 Greenways, Beckenham, BR3 3NQ

- 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 Novica Jevric against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01845/FULL6, dated 21 April 2017, was refused by Notice dated 23 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension & single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is set within a spacious suburban residential area and is occupied by a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The property has previously been extended through the addition of a hip to gable roof extension and a rear dormer extension, which in combination with rooflights has facilitated the conversion of the loft (*LPA ref. DC/16/04983/PLUD*). This development was undertaken in accordance with a Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Development.
 4. The appeal proposals would comprise a first floor hipped side extension and a single storey 'lean-to' rear extension, the latter replacing the existing conservatory. The Council has not raised any concerns over the effect of the single-storey rear extension on the character and appearance of either the host dwelling or the area, and on the basis of my observations, I would agree that it would not appear uncharacteristic in terms of its design approach. As a consequence, I have addressed the principal dispute over the impact of the side extension within this Decision Letter.
 5. Whilst the proposed development would incorporate matching materials, the resultant design approach would appear confused, with the side extension to the dwelling introducing a hipped roof at first floor level which would extend only part of the way up the existing gable, resulting in an awkward appearance to the dwelling. I acknowledge the appellant's point that the proposed
-

extension would not extend closer to the boundary than the extent of the existing ground floor of the dwelling. Nevertheless, the first floor extension would reduce the overall sense of spaciousness between the appeal property and No.31 Greenways. Furthermore, as a consequence of the visibility of the dwelling and existing gap in longer views from Uplands across the open land and junction with Greenways, there would be a limited adverse effect on the streetscene due to the partial infilling of the existing gap at first floor level.

6. Turning to the relationship with No. 35 Greenways, I accept the appellant's contention that the existing gable roof extension completed as permitted development, has eroded the symmetry of the appeal property in comparison with the retained hipped roof of the other half of the semi-detached pair. However, I do not accept that the addition of a further hipped side extension would be justified as a means of addressing the visual effect of the gable roof extension. In this respect, I am satisfied that the addition of the side extension to the appeal property would only succeed in exacerbating the existing unbalanced appearance of the appeal dwelling with No. 35 Greenways. Furthermore, I note that the absence of a setback at the front elevation would partly reduce the effect of any subordination achieved by the lower roof form, and would also make a limited contribution to the imbalance. For these reasons, I consider the proposal would result in an adverse effect on the host dwelling and the streetscene.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention within the Grounds of Appeal to a previous dismissed appeal at the site (*Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3157364*), for a first floor side extension, single storey rear extension & loft conversion with rear dormer. In particular, reference has been made to the approach which the previous Inspector took in assessing the relevance of other cited development in the area at Nos. 8 & 10 Uplands, which it is contended demonstrate a precedent as similar in form and approach to the appeal proposal.
8. I have carefully considered the appellant's submissions in this respect, and have noted the appearance and disposition of the extensions at both Nos. 8 & 10 Uplands, and other extensions observed within the wider area. I accept that the saved Development Plan and supporting Supplementary Planning Guidance pre-dated the previous planning and appeal decisions, and remain in place at the current time. However, I am not persuaded that the disposition and design of the referred to examples are directly comparable to the appeal scheme, or that any similarities with the appeal proposal would be sufficient to overcome the harm which I have identified in respect of the impact on the dwelling and the streetscene.
9. For the reasons set out above, I am satisfied that the proposed development, would result in an incongruous visual effect on the streetscene and the appearance of the existing dwelling, and would not reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposed extension would result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As a consequence, the proposals would conflict with saved Policies H8 and BE1 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006, and the guidance contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance 1: General Design Guidance, and Supplementary Planning Guidance 2: Residential Design Principle. These policies set out that all development proposals will be expected to be of a high standard of design, should complement the scale and form of the host building, and should not detract from the existing street scene, whilst residential side

extensions should be subordinate including maintaining a setback from the façade of the original building.

Other Matters

10. I have noted that the appellant has referred me to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), with particular reference to a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and that planning permission should not be refused for buildings which promote high levels of sustainability. However, no details of the sustainability credentials of the proposal have been advanced, and in any event I have found the proposed development to not accord with the Development Plan and other material considerations. As a consequence I am satisfied that the proposal would not be sustainable development.
11. Interested parties have raised other concerns, including in respect of the effect of the proposals on the living conditions of neighbouring properties, having regard to the effects on light and privacy. Whilst I have been mindful of these concerns, as well as the submissions of the Council and the appellant on the same issues, as a consequence of my conclusions on the main issue, the determination of this appeal has not turned on these matters, and there has not therefore been any need to address them.

Conclusions

12. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

M Seaton

INSPECTOR