
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3234143

50 Springpark Drive, Beckenham BR3 6QD

- 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 and Mrs Richards against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/01622/FULL6, dated 2 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first floor side extension at 50 Springpark Drive, Beckenham BR3 6QD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/19/01622/FULL6, dated 2 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: LP01, ST02, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105 & 106.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the host property.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The area is residential in nature and the dwellings on this part of Springpark Drive are set around a cul-de-sac. Those at the head of the cul-de-sac are linked by garages at ground floor level while those flanking it are linked at both ground and first floor level.
4. The appeal proposal relates to a first-floor extension which would be set off from the side elevation of No 48 by 1 metre at first floor level. The garage below would remain adjoined to the neighbouring dwelling.

5. Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan states that in relation to extensions the Council will normally require a minimum space of 1 metre (m) from the side boundary of the site for the full height and length of the building.
6. However, by reason of its use of the word 'normally' Policy 8 acknowledges that there will be occasions, as in this case, where the requirement for a 1m space is not desirable or warranted. Given the linked nature of dwellings on the cul-de-sac, such a space at ground floor level would be inappropriate and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. Further, the supporting text to this policy emphasises that it is the retention of space around residential buildings at first floor and above that is considered most important.
7. The set-off of the extension at the first floor would respect the more open street scene at the head of the cul-de-sac where properties are not linked at this level. Subsequently, the appeal proposal would be appropriate to the character of the street scene and would not appear as a cramped form of development.
8. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies 6 and 8 of the Bromley Local Plan (BLP) (2019) which, amongst other things require that space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area. It would also comply with Policy 37 of the BLP which seeks a high standard of overall design.

Conditions

9. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. Matching materials are required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area and to ensure a complementary relationship with the host dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR