



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1st December 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/17/3180852
26 East Street, Bromley, Kent BR1 1QU

- 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 Terence Wright against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01144/FULL1, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extension of a 2 storey terraced building to provide commercial space on the ground floor and 2 residential units above; a 2 storey outrigger at the rear is to be demolished.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 2 storey Victorian building which is located in the Bromley Town Centre Conservation Area. The property forms part of a short terrace of similar modest properties with commercial uses at the ground floor. The conservation area covers much of the town centre and contains a wide variety of building types and styles. In my judgement the modest Victorian properties here contribute positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area as a result of their design, style and as a reminder of a particular phase of development in the locality. I consider that the rear element of the building, which is typical of its era and form, adds to its positive contribution.
4. The proposal would remove the original rear element of the building and would replace it with a 3 storey extension, extending deep into the site. Dormer windows would be provided to the front and rear of the existing roof slopes. The main body of the rear extension would not seek to replicate the design of the existing building but would be of a modern design, containing a combination of very steep and very shallow roof pitches, metal facing material and rear balconies.

5. The Council has published as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) the Bromley Town Centre Conservation Area Statement. This offers guidance on, amongst other things, extensions to buildings. The SPG advises that extensions should reflect the form, style and materials of the host building. I consider that the proposal wholly fails to follow this advice. As a result of this and the overall scale of the proposal compared to the existing building, I consider that it would fail to harmonise with the building and would unacceptably dominate it, particularly as clear views are available of the rear of the building.
6. In relation to the proposed front dormer, whilst I can see that some effort has gone into its detailed design, I consider that its overall size would mean that it would dominate the roof of this property and would upset the roof form of this short terrace of similar properties.
7. I have taken careful account of the variety of forms of buildings within the area, which includes more modern and larger buildings than at the appeal site. However, I consider that the existing building, which has a relatively modest form, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. In my judgement, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the building and its contribution to the conservation area. Therefore, the proposal would fail to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.
8. I have taken account of the fact that the proposal would provide new homes in an accessible location. However, this is not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies BE1, BE11 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Conclusions

9. For the reasons set out above, I have found that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the conservation area. In relation to the advice in the NPPF, I consider that this is 'less than substantial harm'. I have taken account of all other matters raised by the appellant but I find nothing sufficient to outweigh that harm. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR