
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2017

by Y Wright BSc (Hons) DipTP MSc DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3181072

30 Gates Green Road, West Wickham BR4 9JW

- 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 Dean Remfry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01298/FULL6, dated 20 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2017.
 - The development is single storey elevation and elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey elevation and elevational alterations at 30 Gates Green Road, West Wickham BR4 9JW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/17/01298/FULL6, dated 20 March 2017, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 625-010, 625-011, 625-01, 625-02, 625-03, 625-04 and 625-05.

Procedural Matters

2. The development description set out on the decision notice is different to that set out in the planning application. I requested clarification from both main parties as to whether the change of description had been agreed. The Appellant has confirmed that they did not object to the change at the time. The Council consulted on and determined the application on the basis of the amended description. Accordingly I use the same amended description in my consideration of this appeal and do not refer to development relating to the driveway and dropped kerb.
3. The plans include two rooflights. Whilst I note that three rooflights have been installed in the roof, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans and accordingly consider the application on the basis of two rooflights.

Main Issue

4. The development has already been carried out. The main issue is the effect of the development on the property and character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling set back from the road with the front garden used as a driveway/parking area. It is situated in a predominantly residential area of detached and semi-detached properties of variable design, style, scale and appearance.
6. Both the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006) (UDP) Policies BE1, amongst other things, seek development that is of good design. For residential properties UDP Policy H8 includes seeking extensions that respect or complement the scale, form and materials of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
7. Whilst the development has extended the single storey projection at the front of the property along the entire width of the front elevation, this is to the same depth as the projection that was previously present. Furthermore the addition of a pitched roof to this element reflects the main roof design. The front door porch projects forward of this extension, but only to a relatively small degree and appears proportionately in scale with the front elevation when viewed from the street and does not overly dominate.
8. From what I saw on visiting the locality and taking account of the evidence provided, single storey front projections, front doors and slate effect roof tiles are not uncommon. Furthermore hung tiles and render to front elevations are materials used on other nearby properties. Whilst the size of some of the windows has reduced and rooflights have been introduced in the main roof these do not appear adversely prominent on the property or when viewed from within the street scene.
9. I recognise that the development has a more contemporary look when compared to the original dwelling. Nevertheless the host dwelling is detached, set back from the road and located within an area of mixed residential character. Consequently when viewed within the context of the overall street scene it is not unduly intrusive and the site is not overdeveloped.
10. In considering this appeal my attention has been drawn by both main parties to a previous appeal decision¹ at the site for development that was much more extensive but included the elements that are now before me. I note that the Inspector in that decision found that the same single storey front extension including the porch was acceptable, but ultimately decided not to issue a split decision and to dismiss the appeal as he concluded that these elements were "*part of the comprehensive alteration and refurbishment of the property*" and therefore not "*physically and functionally independent*".
11. Whilst I have considered the previous Inspector's findings, the context of the development that is before me is significantly different, as it does not include the raising of the ridge height or addition of dormer windows. Accordingly I have determined the appeal on its own planning merits.
12. Taking all the above into account, I conclude that the development does not result in material harm to the character and appearance of either the property or the surrounding area. Consequently the development accords with the general thrust of UDP Policies H8 and BE1. It also conforms to Policies 7.4 and

¹ Appeal decision: APP/G5180/D/16/3157275

7.6 of the London Plan (consolidated with alterations since 2011) (March 2015) both of which seek high quality design that respects local character.

13. Other concerns raised relate to the removal of the front wall and the impact on the amount of street parking available. However as set out under my procedural matters above, this does not form part of the development that is before me and I therefore have not considered it.

Conditions

14. Although three conditions have been suggested by the Council, as the development is already built, I attach only one condition to my decision specifying the approved plans, to ensure certainty.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Y Wright

INSPECTOR