

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2019

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3231497

156 Woodside Avenue, Chislehurst, BR7 6BS

- 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 Mrs Louise D'Angelo Lawson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/00152/FULL6, dated 11 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions at 158 Woodside Avenue, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling within an established residential area. Semi-detached properties along this side of Woodside Avenue originally had detached garages to their sides, such that there would have been large gaps between the pairs of dwellings and regular spacing to the pattern of development. However, many houses have been extended to their sides, including at No 156 and at the unattached neighbouring property at No 158. Although not shown on any of the application drawings, the original side detached garage at No 158 has been demolished in favour of a two-storey side extension that projects to within approximately 1m of the shared side boundary between both dwellings. This property has no extensions to the rear beyond its original alignment.
4. The existing extensions to No 156 project to the side of the original building at two-storey and to within approximately 1m of the side boundary. There is also a single-storey rear extension across the full width of the dwelling. This has a stepped rear elevation and projects over 5m nearest to No 158 and around 3m across the remainder of its width. The proposal is to add a 3m deep first floor

extension across approximately half the width of the existing, extended dwelling, and positioned nearest to the boundary with No 158.

5. Nos 156 and 158 are on slightly staggered building lines, with the appeal property set around 2m deeper into its plot compared with No 158, with the existing single-storey extension projecting over 7m beyond the rear wall of No 158. As a result, the new first floor extension, at 3m in depth, would project beyond the rear wall of No 158 by around 5m. There is a clear glazed ground floor rear window to No 158 positioned nearest to the common side boundary. In the aspect from this window, which appeared to serve a living space, the tall and expansive two-storey flank wall to the enlarged appeal property would be clearly seen, at just a very shallow oblique angle and at reasonably close quarters, as a visually dominant and intrusive incursion of new built form. Furthermore, the enclosing impact of the extension upon the neighbouring amenities would be atypical for the pattern of development in the area where generally, residents can reasonably expect to enjoy a largely open aspect over their rear garden plots and, more expansively, obliquely over neighbouring gardens.
6. I appreciate that the appellant has close ties with the locality and that they have invested a lot of effort and resources into improving the dwelling. I also recognise that the additional bedroom spaces proposed are needed for the benefit of their growing family. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the neighbour's living conditions through the visually overbearing impact of the proposal.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given, due to its size and siting, I find that the proposed extension would be harmful to the living conditions at 158 Woodside Avenue. As such, it would conflict with Policies 6 *Residential Extensions* and Policy 37 *General Design of Development* of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 (LP) which, amongst other things, require the scale and form of alterations to be compatible with development in the surrounding area, and to respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings. For these same reasons the proposal would fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as it relates to the creation of high quality buildings and places which provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. As such, the proposal would not satisfy the Framework's environmental objective for achieving a sustainable form of development.
8. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR