



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Beverley Doward BSc BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3247248

12 Beckenham Road, West Wickham BR4 0QT

- 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 Alpen Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/04645/FULL6, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing side addition and erection of a proposed single storey front/side wraparound extension with roof alterations, garage alterations and rear canopy and 3x roof lights, formation of a front and side boundary walls and drawings alterations and some internal and external alterations, demolition and remodelling to facilitate the works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing side addition and erection of a proposed single storey front/side wraparound extension with roof alterations, garage alterations and rear canopy and 3x roof lights, formation of a front and side boundary walls and drawings alterations and some internal and external alterations, demolition and remodelling to facilitate the works at 12 Beckenham Road, West Wickham BR4 0QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/04645/FULL6, dated 30 October 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: LP01, BP02, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125 Rev A, 126, 127.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. A full set of plans which accompanied the planning application were not received until after the site visit took place. However, I am satisfied that there was sufficient information before me to fully assess the appeal proposal on site. The appeal has been considered on the basis of the same plans that were before the Council when it made its decision on the planning application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey detached dwelling with two detached outbuildings to the side, located within a suburban residential setting. The site has a wide and spacious frontage with an in-out driveway and hedges at the boundary. The proposal includes various alterations to the main dwelling and garage, including a single storey front and side wraparound extension and a new boundary treatment to the front of the property comprising a brick wall with railings. The Council's concerns relate solely to these aspects of the proposed development and therefore will be the focus of this assessment.
6. The proposed wraparound extension would bring the front elevation of the host dwelling further forward in the site, however this would not be by a substantial amount. The dwelling is located a good distance from the road and, although the proposal would be highly visible from the public realm, it would not appear imposing from the streetscene. The extension would elongate the width of the property. However, the single storey nature and minimal depth of the proposed front and side extension would ensure that it appears subservient and sympathetic to the existing dwelling.
7. The existing bay windows on the front elevation of the dwelling would be removed by the proposal. Although they are an interesting feature, they do not make a significant enough contribution to the appearance of the dwelling to justify withholding planning permission. The proposal, including the new front porch and flat roof elements, would modernise the appearance of the dwelling and the stepped front elevation and variety of roof profiles would complement the modern appearance of the dwelling and would not be unsympathetic in nature. These aspects of the proposal would not be notably out of keeping with the current character and appearance of the property as a suburban family dwelling on a spacious plot.
8. The proposed boundary wall would replace existing low-level planting along the front boundary. Consequently, it would give the front of the site a more solid and developed appearance. However, there are a number of other examples of similar boundary treatments within the surrounding area, which irrespective of whether or not they have the benefit of planning permission, contribute towards the character and appearance of this suburban residential area. The open design of the proposed wall, including railings, and its modest height would be a suitable and typical feature for this residential location. Therefore, it would not erode the spacious nature of the streetscene and would not be a visually intrusive addition to the front of the property.

9. For the reasons above, I consider that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and therefore would not be in conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2016). These Policies seek to ensure that residential extensions have a high standard of design, layout and architectural quality and that the scale, form and materials respect those of the host dwelling and are compatible with development in the surrounding area.

Other Matters

10. Concerns were raised by an interested party at the planning application stage regarding the retention of a side wall on the boundary with a neighbouring property and the need for security during the construction process if the wall was to be removed. There were also concerns regarding the ownership of an existing boundary fence. However, these are civil matters to which I cannot attach any significant weight, and would not outweigh my findings on the main issue.
11. Comments were made regarding the number of planning applications submitted and the duration of the construction period should they all be built. All approved development must begin not later than 3 years from the date of the decision, and a condition has been included to this extent, however the duration of construction cannot be limited in the same manner.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Beverley Doward

INSPECTOR