



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3240950

55 Windermere Road, West Wickham, BR4 9AP

- 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 Makit Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/02716/FULL6, dated 20 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor side & rear and first floor side & rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a cat slide roof and a detached garage to the rear. The property is located within a residential area which is made up of pairs of similarly designed semi-detached properties some of which have been extended. The proposal would provide a two-storey side and rear extension and a single storey side and rear extension, which would replace the existing garage outbuilding.
5. The proposed extensions would significantly change the appearance of the dwelling. Nonetheless, many other properties along Windermere Road have been extended, largely with a box dormer on the side elevation. Therefore, although the proposal would make the semi-detached pair of dwellings unsymmetrical, this is the case for many of the pairs of dwellings along this road. In this context, the proposal would not appear unusual or out of place.
6. The proposal would also result in the loss of the cat slide roof, which is a feature of most dwellings with the streetscene. However, there are several

examples of other first floor side extension which have resulted in the loss of this roof feature. These changes have therefore had an influence on the street's character and as such it is not considered that this part of the development would have a harmful impact upon the overall streetscene.

7. However the cumulative impact of the proposed extensions, including the extensions to the side and the rear of the property, are excessive in size and would not be a subservient addition to the original property. This collective impact is exacerbated by the significant depth of the single storey and first-floor rear extensions and the overall length of the garage, utility room and gym side extension which would replace the small and fairly inconspicuous garage outbuilding. As a consequence of its scale and mass, the proposal would overwhelm the modest proportions of the existing building and appear out of character with the host dwelling. These impacts would be visible, in part from the gap between dwellings, and also in private views from surrounding properties. The unacceptable scale of the development would therefore be readily apparent. I note the proposal may make use of vacant land and improve the quality of living conditions for the occupier, but this would not outweigh the resultant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant has highlighted the use of quality materials which match that of the existing dwelling, however this would not overcome the overly large and dominant nature of the proposal. It is also noted that other properties within the area have had extensions and the appellant has stated that No.10 and No.14 Windermere Road have been granted permission for single storey side and rear extensions and therefore a consistent approach has not been taken by the Council. No further details of these other properties have been provided and a single storey extension alone would be greatly different to the proposal before me. I therefore give limited weight to these other developments. It was also noted during the site visit that there are other two storey side extension within the area, however these vary in size and design and are not directly comparable to the proposed development.
9. For the reasons above, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019) which collectively seek to ensure new development has a positive contribution to the existing streetscene and public realm, with a high standard of design, and that the scale, form and materials respect the host dwelling.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has stated that the proposal would not impact neighbouring properties through loss of light or loss of privacy. However, this is a neutral factor which would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
11. It is noted that the Council included Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) within their reason for refusal. However, this relates to heritage assets and archaeology and is not applicable to the appeal proposal before me. Therefore, it has not been taken into consideration for this appeal.

Conclusions and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR