
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2020

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3246047
303 Pickhurst Rise, West Wickham BR4 0AH

- 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 Robert Wright against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/03901/FULL6, dated 9 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of proposed development from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area and host property.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a corner plot at the junction of Pickhurst Rise and Pickhurst Lane. Along Pickhurst Lane the residential properties are set back from the highway behind front gardens and driveways. The public house, north of the appeal site, also has a set back from the highway. Further along Pickhurst Lane those properties at the junctions of Crest Road and Langley Way are also set back behind gardens and driveways. These set backs create a distinctiveness to the character of the Pickhurst Lane street scene giving it a sense of place. Although the appeal property and No 362 Pickhurst Rise opposite flank onto Pickhurst Lane, the dwellings are stepped away from Pickhurst Lane.
5. The two storey extension would bring built development substantially closer to Pickhurst Lane than that of existing development within the vicinity of the appeal site. This encroachment would be out of keeping with the open character of the Pickhurst Lane street scene and would represent a diminution of its spacious appearance.

6. The appeal site is situated at a high point at Pickhurst Lane. I observed that part of the first storey and the roof of the existing property is clearly visible in views from Pickhurst Lane above the existing boundary hedge and vegetation. The extension, being two storey, would also be highly visible in public views when travelling along Pickhurst Lane. I acknowledge that the proposal would be positioned at least one metre from the side boundary. Nonetheless, the extension would appear as an uncharacteristic and discordant projection of built development into the openness of the Pickhurst Lane street scene. Consequently, the proposal would be wholly out of keeping and, for this reason, would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the area. This harm would be apparent in public views from Pickhurst Lane.
7. The area is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings that vary in size, form and appearance, as the photographs provided by the appellant clearly illustrate. Whilst the eaves and ridgeline of the proposed side extension would match the host dwelling, there would be a step back from its frontage that would create a visual subservience to its appearance. I do not consider the extension, despite its width and aligned roof form, would appear appreciable disproportionate in size to that of the host dwelling. Furthermore, I do not consider the resulting appearance of the extended dwelling would be out of keeping when viewed within the context of the other properties along Pickhurst Rise. Although I consider the proposed side extension would be a visually acceptable addition to the host dwelling, this does not overcome the harm that I have identified above that would arise to the Pickhurst Lane street scene.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016. Although development plan policy does not specifically require openness at the side of properties to be maintained, these policies nonetheless seek, amongst other matters, residential development, including extensions, to provide more generous side space where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, having regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets and to positively contribute to the existing street scene. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework that requires development to be sympathetic to local character and to maintain a strong sense of place.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR