
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3233563
23 Bushey Way, Beckenham BR3 6TA

- 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 Craig Travis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/01753/FULL6, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear, part two storey rear & two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within the Park Langley locally designated Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). Policy 44 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Development Framework Local Plan January 2019 (LP) states that development in ASRC's will be required to respect, enhance and strengthen their special and distinctive qualities. The description of the ASRC has been carried forward from the former Unitary Development Plan. It states that the area 'represents a coherent, continuous and easily identifiable area, which has maintained its character and unity intact'.
4. The appeal property is within a frontage of mixed detached and semi-detached houses of various design and mainly in generous plots set back from the road frontage. Bushey Way is a wider than average road that provides a spacious and attractive residential environment.
5. Policy 6 of the LP requires spaces and gaps to be respected where they contribute to character. Policy 8 of the LP requires that a clear space between properties of a minimum of 1 metre be provided. Where a higher standard exists within residential areas proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space. The text to the policy explains that its purpose is to prevent a cramped appearance and prevent 'terracing' from occurring. At my site visit I observed the various extensions and alterations along Bushey Way. I noted that there is a wide variety of spaces between buildings. Having regard

to this, I conclude that, in principle, the extension of the appeal property in a way that retains a space of 1.25 metres to the side boundary at ground and first floor level would not unduly detract from the spacious qualities of the area.

6. Policy 6 of the LP also requires residential extensions to be of a scale, form and materials that respect or complement the host dwelling and are compatible with development in the surrounding area. Policy 37 requires that development has a high standard of design and layout, is imaginative and attractive and positively contributes to the existing street scene.
7. The proposal includes extending above the existing roof on the front elevation and extending at two storeys to the side. The form of the existing roof with long sloping detail terminating at approximately single storey eaves height is a unifying characteristic of the appeal property and its immediate neighbours which contributes positively to the street scene. The proposed additions to the roof and side extension would remove this design detail. The appearance of the extended property would lack visual interest by comparison with the original building. The loss of the unifying design detail would detract from the appearance of the semi-detached properties as a pair in the wider street scene.
8. I recognise that the appellant has sought to reduce the scale of the proposed extensions following earlier refused applications by the Council. However, the proposed extensions would still be significant in scale. The two-storey flat roofed rear extension would be visible from adjacent properties and to some extent from Overhill Way where the side boundary of 21 Bushey Way and the gradual rise of Bushey Way allows some visibility of the rear of the appeal property. This rear extension would also be a significant feature of the views from 25 Bushey Way where the land levels dictate that the upper part of the rear extension would be apparent. The scale, mass and design of the rear flat roofed addition would be at odds with the attractive pitched roof detail of the existing and surrounding buildings and would be a discordant feature which would detract from the area's prevailing character.
9. Consequently, I conclude because of its scale, mass and design the development would detract from the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to Policies 6, 8, 37 and 44 of the LP.
10. In coming to a view, I note that several properties on Overhill Way and Bushey Way have been extended and altered in a way that has resulted in the loss of the original roof form. In some cases, this has also resulted in unbalanced pairs of semi-detached properties. However, in this case the roof form is a unifying feature of the property with its neighbours. I am required to determine this appeal in accordance with the development plan and I find that the details of the scheme conflict with it for the reasons set out above.
11. I appreciate that No 21 has been extended and that the garage has been brought forward on the plot. However, the alterations and extensions at No 21 have not detracted from the overall appearance of the houses as a pair and the design has had regard to the original architectural detail.

Other Matters

12. I acknowledge the neighbour's concern that the proposal could harm their living conditions. However, given that I am dismissing the appeal on the basis of the main issue, I have not considered this matter further.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR