

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3251215

5 Uplands, Beckenham BR3 3NB

- 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 Tyurin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/00200/FULL6, dated 13 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear/side extension; new single storey front extension; new first floor side extension; new loft conversion with hip to gable conversion and new rear dormer & roof lights to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling in a residential road of predominantly similar dwelling types. No 5 forms a uniform pair with No 7. Both properties have a 'catslide' roof with a forward-facing gabled bay across two storeys.
 4. Policy 8 of the Council's Local Plan concerns space around new residential development, including extensions. It requires that for a proposal of two or more storeys in height a minimum one metre space from the site's side boundary should be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall. In this case, while the extended first floor would be inset, the ground floor would not as the single storey side extension would be positioned on the shared boundary.
 5. Policy 6 of the Local Plan concerns residential extensions and, amongst other criteria, requires that space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area. Uplands includes varied designs of semi-detached dwellings, but a common characteristic of the street is a good degree of separation between pairs of
-

dwelling. This is particularly the case at first floor level where 'catslide' or fully hipped roofs enable generous views between properties, giving a spacious and open aspect to the suburban setting.

6. A number of properties have extended upper storeys, but where these have occurred the roofs have either a full hip or, as at No 13, a gable conversion of limited width, which thereby retains a good extent of separation from its neighbour. Similarly, the extended roof with a gable at No 1 is similar in width to No 13 and is at the start of the street and so is next to the rear garden of the nearest dwelling. The appeal proposal involves an upper floor extension that would be more extensive, bringing the gabled side elevation parallel with the current full width of the property at ground level. As such, the proposal would add considerable bulk, comprehensively infilling the space created by the 'catslide' roof.
7. The effects of this would be to reduce considerably the characteristic space between the appeal property and its neighbouring dwelling. While the single storey side extension seen in isolation would have a limited effect, in combination with the changes to the upper storey the overall effect would be of a cramped and uncharacteristic form of overdevelopment. Moreover, the extended bulky roof would upset the proportions of the existing dwelling, particularly the size of the two-storey gabled bay would not be proportionate to the extent of the extended roof. The small barn hip would have little mitigating effect on the degree of harm resulting from the extensive changes proposed.
8. The changes to the roof would also significantly alter the visual relationship between the pair of semi-detached dwellings. I am unaware of the background to the changes at No 13, but the more limited gable conversion to that property has in my view harmfully undermined the uniformity and balance with its adjoining neighbour, No 15. These effects would be more pronounced in the relationship between the appeal property and No 7, with the bulky extended roof contrasting unfavourably with the original roof profile to No 7.
9. The dormer proposed for the rear roof slope would be set down from the main ridge and in from either side. An example of a similar dormer is visible to the rear at No 1. However, despite this positioning on the roof slope and this form of extension not being uncharacteristic, the proposed dormer would cover the fully extended roof, which has already been found to be a bulky and uncharacteristic change. Consequently, the width of the dormer on the extended roof would harmfully reinforce the extent and bulk of the overall changes to the roof. While this feature would not be visible from the public realm it would be seen from neighbouring gardens, from which views the harmful effects described would be readily apparent.
10. I agree with the Council's view that the single storey rear and front extensions would be limited in scale, proportionate to the host dwelling and in the case of the front extension would include design features to match the existing frontage. As such, I find no harm in respect of these elements of the overall proposal.
11. I have had regard to the appellants' contention that the proposed development accords with government intentions to enable greater flexibility to extend properties through permitted development rights. However, I am required to

address the current proposal before me, which involves an application for planning permission and therefore I give this matter limited weight and it does not alter my overall conclusion.

12. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, I conclude that taken as a whole the changes proposed would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 6 and 8 of the Local Plan, referred to above, and to Policy 37 of the Local Plan, which, amongst other matters, requires development to positively contribute to the existing street scene. It also conflicts with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan, which concern the design quality of development and its effect on local character. I disagree with the appellants that Policy 7.6 is not relevant; while it is a strategic policy it articulates a broad requirement for architectural quality and, therefore, is supportive of more detailed local policies. All the policies referred to are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly section twelve concerning good design.

Other Matters

13. I acknowledge that the proposed extensions are intended to create additional living space. However, these personal circumstances do not overcome the permanent harm and policy conflict that I have found would result from the proposal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR