



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2020

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12/11/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3249778

24A Beaumont Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1JN

- 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 Nanwani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/05243/FULL6, dated 12 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing conservatory; the addition of a first floor to the bungalow with a loft conversion and front rooflight; a part two storey front extension and a part two storey rear extension with elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing conservatory; the addition of a first floor to the bungalow with a loft conversion and front rooflight; a part two storey front extension and a part two storey rear extension with elevational alterations at 24A Beaumont Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1JN, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/19/05243/FULL6, dated 12 December 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: 3403-19-PL001 Revision P5, 3403-19-PL002 Revision P4 and 3403-19-PL003 Revision P4.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. This stretch of Beaumont Road is broadly characterised by semi-detached and detached properties of very varied design and form. The buildings are set back from the road on deep plots, and are mainly two storeys high, although there is a scattering of bungalows, as on the appeal site. There are also nearby examples of roof extensions to provide extra accommodation.

4. The host property sits on a fairly narrow plot, and is lower in height, and much less substantial in scale, than its two storey neighbours. As a result of this proposal, its character would change markedly, and its scale and bulk would be significantly increased. The resultant dwelling's relatively narrow front face but two storey height and half-hipped roof, would give it a more vertical emphasis than its neighbours either side.
5. However, it would continue to be set back from the highway on a deep plot. Its ridge height would be comparable to that at No 24, and slightly greater than No 26. Its front-facing gable would reflect the broadly similar features on those properties. The scheme would also be finished in materials to match those on the host property.
6. Consequently, whilst I have considered the rising topography along this stretch of Beaumont Road, in the context of the very varied form, massing, style and appearance of the properties, the resultant dwelling would not appear out of place. As the buildings are not to a consistent scale or character, the proposal would not harm the streetscene.
7. In general terms, Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 require development, including extensions, to be to a high standard of design, which compliments the scale, form and materials of the host and the surrounding area, and to positively contribute to the streetscene. For the above reasons, whilst the scheme would significantly increase the scale of this building, it would not conflict with the broad thrust of those policies, nor with the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement for good design which is sympathetic to local character.

Other matters

8. As a result of this scheme, the main habitable room windows and the principal outlook from No 24A would continue to be to the front and the rear, and would not afford a significant outlook towards No 26.
9. The two storey section of the resultant dwelling would project beyond the two storey rear section of No 26. The host property would have a retained single storey section, but with a reduced roof height, beyond.
10. The upper floors of the scheme would be set in slightly from the site's side boundaries and its roof would slope away from them. As depicted on drawing no. 3403-19-PL-001 P5 those upper floors would not interrupt a 45 degree line drawn from the centre of No. 26's nearest rear first floor window; and there are no habitable room windows in the flank of that property facing this site. Consequently, the scheme would not give rise to a significant overbearing impact on those occupants, or impact their outlook and privacy to a harmful degree.
11. For similar reasons, notwithstanding the siting of No 26 to the north-west of this site, on the basis of the available evidence, the scheme would not cause them a harmful loss of light, or a significant overshadowing impact.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition, and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

13. Additionally, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring the scheme to be faced with matching materials.
14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR