
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2019

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3229366
102 Stapleton Road, Bromley BR6 9TR

- 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 Antonio Zoccola against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/00929/FULL6, dated 24 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the addition of first floor extension to left hand side 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 surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey dwelling with an attached flat roof single garage. The construction of the garage has resulted in the property spanning the width of the plot at ground floor level. The dwelling is located within a spacious suburban area broadly comprised of similar two storey dwellings, a small number of which have been extended. The main roof style in the area is predominately gable end and this gives a harmony and discernible character.
4. The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation of the appeal property and lowered from the ridge with a hipped roof and has been designed to be subservient to the existing dwelling. However, the hipped roof is not characteristic of the local area and therefore would appear as a stark and discordant addition that would be harmful to the street scene.
5. The proposed extension at first floor, would continue the development along the boundary of 102 Stapleton Road (No 102) and therefore would be reliant on the gap between 104 Stapleton Road (No 104) and its side boundary to prevent visual terracing from occurring. It is untypical for a property to span its plot over two storeys.
6. No 104, due to the site levels, is set at a higher level than No 102 and also has its garage on the opposite side to the appeal site. The appellant has suggested

that development of a side extension on this property would not be possible and therefore terracing would not occur. However, I have no substantive evidence before me which indicates that No 104 can not be extended and it is not appropriate to restrict future development of that property by relying on it to maintain the gap between the properties to prevent terracing.

7. Policy 8 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Development Framework Local Plan (January 2019) (LP) requires extensions of two or more storeys in height to retain a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary for the full height and length of the building. The supporting text to the policy states that this is important to prevent a cramped appearance and related terracing from occurring. The proximity of the proposed extension to the boundary would be at odds with this policy and whilst aspects of the extension would be subservient to the main house, the overall effect would be harmful to the street scene.
8. Both parties have made reference to other side extensions and whilst I have not been provided with full details of these, I noted from my site visit that No 85 was built along the footpath which provides a suitable level of spacing between the properties. I also understand that other examples at No 140 and No 144 have sufficient spacing between them to comply with Policy 8 of the LP.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and this would be at odds with Policy 8 of the LP, which seeks to secure development that retains a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary for the full height and length of the building, to prevent a cramped appearance and related terracing from occurring.
10. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR