
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by Paul Thompson DipTRP MAUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3239041

115 Chatham Avenue, Hayes, Bromley BR2 7QE

- 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 & Mrs Waite against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/02513/FULL6, dated 10 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Procedural Guide Planning Appeals – England states that *only the person who made the planning application can make an appeal*. In this case, the appeal was lodged by Mrs Kerry Waite. The applicant has subsequently provided clarification in writing that she is one of the applicants and both applicants' forenames should have been included on the Appeal Form. Nevertheless, as the appeal cannot technically be transferred to another person, it must continue in the original name of the applicants. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. Despite the description of development set out above, I consider the description found on the Decision Notice better reflects the scheme that is before me and that which the Council considered. The development proposed is therefore for a 'part one/two storey rear and side extensions and alteration to rear steps'. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the existing pair of houses and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is situated within an area that is residential in character, primarily formed of pairs of modestly sized two-storey houses, closely spaced alongside one another and finished externally in an art deco style. Although the spacing to either side of Nos 115 and 117 is not symmetrical, the pair of properties currently retain much of their architectural form and symmetry.

6. The appeal property is prominent and highly visible as it is positioned at the corner of Chatham Avenue and Constance Crescent. Whilst it clearly has a closer affiliation with Chatham Avenue, as the house is forward of the properties in Constance Crescent, the space alongside it currently provides separation from this street. The house is primarily faced with pebble dash but incorporates render within the front entrance area and above sill level at first floor. There is also feature brick work to either side of the front door and the corner of the house at first floor.
7. Taken together, these features make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the existing pair of houses and the street scene.
8. Given the arrangement of properties in the locality, the opportunities for side extensions are more limited. There are, however, some houses with façades closer to the highway within the immediate vicinity of the site, including No 113 to the opposite corner of Chatham Avenue, which has been extended to the side.
9. The first floor of the proposal would align with the front façade of the house and the existing roof overhang to the front would remain. The existing feature brickwork at the first-floor corner of the house would not be retained or replicated in the extension. The proposed two-storey extensions would incorporate subordinate hipped roofs to the side and rear, with a lower ridgeline and pitch that would match the existing house but the proposed roof over the entrance of the house would not be hipped to the side like others in the vicinity.
10. Nevertheless, the proposed two-storey side extension would significantly extend and alter the existing house, filling the majority of the existing space between the house and Constance Crescent and continuing beyond the rear of the house into the proposed single and two-storey extensions at the rear. The proposed elevation to Constance Crescent would therefore be continuous, along the same plane and only interrupted by a single window at first floor and a door and window at ground floor.
11. The proposed extensions would add so significantly to the extent of the appeal property that they would unbalance the pair of properties and appear dominant and imposing in relation to the modest scale of the existing house. The proposal would also appear at odds with the architecture of the existing pair of houses, as well as other houses found within the vicinity.
12. I have been referred to extensions in the locality that have been granted permission by the Council. The extension of No 113 is not comparable with the appeal scheme before me as it does not include other projections to the rear. Similarly, I have been referred to a development at 145 Hayes Lane for flats which would also not be comparable with the appeal scheme. I note that with the proposal there would be more symmetry to either side of the entrance to Constance Crescent but this, and the existence of other extensions in the local area, would not provide justification for the proposed development. I have considered the appeal proposal on its own individual merits and found that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the appearance of the pair of houses and the street scene. Hence the proposal would not accord with Policies 6 and 37 of the

London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (Adopted January 2019) (LP). Together these policies expect extensions to existing buildings to be of a high standard of design, layout and architectural quality. In particular, the scale and form of residential extensions should respect or complement the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area, including by positively contributing to the existing street scene.

14. I am mindful that the appeal property is not listed and the site is not situated within a conservation area or area of special interest, so the protection of the appearance of the area would not be afforded the same statutory protection. Whilst this may be the case, these matters do not obviate the need to accord with the abovementioned policies of the LP.

Other Matters

15. I note that the Council and occupiers of neighbouring properties did not raise any concerns with regard to the effect of the proposal on their living conditions, particularly in respect of outlook. I also accept that the location of the existing house meets the appellants' personal circumstances and the additional accommodation is required to meet their needs. However, consideration of these matters does not lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

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

Paul Thompson

INSPECTOR