



Appeal Decision

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/19/3233654

10 Union Road, Bromley BR2 9SB

- 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 Richard Halliday against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref 19/00814/FULL1, dated 18 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the removal of a detached garage and erection of an attached single story 1 bed house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposed development on;
 - the character and appearance of the area and,
 - highway safety with particular reference to parking.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located in a residential area which is characterised by a variety of two-storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced dwelling houses on relatively spacious plots. Some dwellings have extensions to the side and rear of the properties which form part of the host building.
4. The site lies at the junction of Union Road and Whitehall Road. 10 Union Road is a semi-detached property with a single storey, detached garage to one side. The development would create a one-bedroom, one-person dwelling attached to the side of No 10 following the demolition of the existing garage. The proposal would have its own entrance on Union Road and a flank elevation of approximately 12m on Whitehall Road with high level windows. Two parking spaces would be formed at the rear of the garden of No 10 and accessed on Whitehall Road. One of these spaces would be available to the new dwelling.

5. As a consequence of this context, the proposal would create two narrow, co-joined plots. The area, while offering a range of design styles, is not typified by additional on plot dwellings; rather extensions and alterations which integrate with the host dwelling design style and fenestration which do not disrupt the rhythm and pattern of the wider area. The proposal would also be tightly sited to the side of No 10 as a separate dwelling and as such would be harmful to the visual appearance of the existing street-scene where there tends to be a degree of separation between buildings.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore, be contrary to Policies 4 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (BLP) which state amongst other things that that new housing development should make a positive contribution to the area in which it is located and complement the scale, proportion and form of the adjacent buildings and areas. It would also be contrary to Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) which seeks similar aims.
7. For similar reasons, the proposal would be contrary to the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, including Paragraph 127 which indicates the developments should be visually attractive and be sympathetic to the local character of the surrounding built environment.

Highway Safety

8. Union Road is a residential area with no obvious parking restrictions. I noted some on-street parking opportunities at the time of my site visit. However, I acknowledge that the availability of on-street parking may well rise and fall during the course of the day.
9. The submitted drawings show that it is possible to park two vehicles to the rear of the property using part of the long garden to the rear of No 10. However, the drawings lack detail with regards to dimensions and the proposed crossover, although this could be dealt with by way of a condition. Therefore, I find in this instance, the proposed spaces would nonetheless be usable as a parking area.
10. On this basis, the proposed development would be unlikely to have a significant effect on highway safety having particular regard to parking. Consequently, it accords with Policy 30 of the BLP which requires that off-street parking spaces to be provided in a new residential development.

Conclusions

11. Although I have found in favour of the appellant with regard to Highway Safety this does not overcome the harm to the Character and Appearance of the area. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR