
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 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/19/3227995

6 Serviden Drive, Bromley BR1 2UB

- 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 Jarvis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/18/05501/FULL6, dated 11 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is minor front and rear extensions, relocation of front entrance door and first floor side extension over existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Serviden Drive is a residential estate of mainly detached properties of various design and siting with a similar architectural style. Properties are set back from the road frontage with generally open front gardens and off-street parking.
4. Policy 6 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Development Framework Local Plan January 2019 (LP) requires spaces and gaps between buildings to be respected where they contribute to character. Policy 8 of the LP states that extensions of two or more storeys should retain a space of a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary for the full height and length of the building, or where higher standards of separation exist proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space. The text to the policy explains that as well as ensuring adequate privacy and amenity, the policy's purpose is to prevent a cramped appearance and unrelated 'terracing' from occurring and to protect the high spatial standards and levels of visual amenity which characterises many of the Boroughs residential areas.
5. The appeal property and most adjacent plots have garages or single storey side additions with flat roofs located close to or on joint boundaries. These single storey structures enclose the ground floor space with the area above these providing the space between plots. The character and appearance of Serviden Drive is in part derived from the space created by the gaps between buildings

- at first floor level which provide the views and permeability that give the street its spacious character.
6. The appeal property and the neighbouring property No 8 are similarly sited and designed. No 4 is set forward of the appeal site and is a different house type with wider front elevation and gable rather than hipped roof. The proposed first floor side extension would, according to the drawings, retain a distance to the joint boundary with No 4 of 1 metre and a distance of 2.145 metres to the side gable. The position of No 4 and the recessed siting of the extension would limit its visibility in the street scene. Nevertheless, the siting of the extension would reduce the gap between the plots limiting views through the site and detracting from the spacious character of the street. In this respect the siting of the extension would harm the character of the street in a small but unduly harmful way.
 7. The appeal property has a shallow, hipped, pitched roof with relatively large ornate overhanging eaves detail. The extension is designed with a pitched roof with front gable. It has no similar eaves detail and would connect awkwardly with the existing roof design. Because of its design which lacks reference to the detail of the existing building the extension would appear as an awkward and incongruous feature in the street scene and would not sit comfortably against the design of the host property.
 8. Consequently, I conclude that due to its siting and design the first floor extension would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the area. It would conflict with Policy 6, Policy 8 and Policy 37 of the LP and Supplementary Design Guidance (SPG) 1 Design in Bromley and SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance. These collectively seek to ensure development is imaginative and attractive to look at, of good architectural quality and complementary in terms of scale, proportion, form, layout, materials and adequate separation.
 9. The Council is satisfied that the details of the ground floor front and rear extensions are acceptable, and I would agree.

Other Matters

10. I noted the other extensions to which the appellant refers. However, based on the information before me and my site visit, I do not consider that these are directly comparable to the appeal proposals. In any event, each proposal must be considered on its own individual merits.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR