



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2020

by Michael J Muston BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 December 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3252575

30 Crystal Palace Park Road, Sydenham, London SE26 6UG

- 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 Skinner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/00467/FULL6, dated 31 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension with double height bay window (to the northern side of the building) a first floor side extension with a flat roof (to the rear southern side of the building), and alterations to the existing roof involving a change to its pitch and height, a replacement front dormer window and a new rear dormer window and 2 no. rooflights to each of the front and side roofslopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension with double height bay window (to the northern side of the building) a first floor side extension with a flat roof (to the rear southern side of the building), and alterations to the existing roof involving a change to its pitch and height, a replacement front dormer window and a new rear dormer window and 2 no. rooflights to each of the front and side roofslopes, at 30 Crystal Palace Park Road, Sydenham, London SE26 6UG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/20/00467/FULL6, dated 31 January 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1821/00, 1821/02, 1821/03, 1821/04, 1821/09, 1821/00-G, 1821/02-G, 1821/03-G, 1821/04-G, 1821/05-G, 1821/06-G, 1821/07-G, 1821/08-G.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a row of five detached houses in large plots on the eastern side of Crystal Palace Park Road. These houses sit within a wider residential area, which contains a mix of dwellings, varying in type, size, age, and design. Within this considerable variety, the five detached houses do by comparison exhibit a degree of similarity. However, No 28 appears to be a much newer property, whilst most of the other houses from Nos 30-36 have been altered, extended and rendered/painted in different colours. As a result, whilst they are all large houses on large plots, set a similar distance back from the road, I do not consider that they are perceived as a group when seen from Crystal Palace Park Road.
4. The proposed two storey and first floor side extensions would increase the bulk and width of No 30. However, I agree with the Inspector in the previous appeal (APP/G5180/D/19/3238956) that they would not, in themselves, be harmful to the appearance of the row of detached houses within the street. The Inspector in that appeal was primarily concerned with the roof extensions proposed at that time, and I share that view.
5. In my opinion, the proposals now before me represent a considerable improvement over those considered in that previous appeal. They still involve an increase in the height of the roof of about 0.7 metre and a steepening of the pitch of the roof compared to the existing situation. However, this steepening is notably less marked than in the earlier scheme and consequently the width of the roof at the greater height has been significantly reduced. The result in my opinion is a roof structure that would no doubt appear different from some of the other neighbouring houses, but not significantly so, and would not appear as being out of keeping with its surroundings.
6. I noted on my site visit that No 32 has been extended and has a roof form that includes an area of flat roof, although this is not immediately apparent when seen from the road. The proposed roof in the appeal proposal shares some similarities with that now in existence at No 32 and I do not believe it would appear as dominant and incongruous in its setting, as argued by the Council.
7. The proposed rear dormer window has also been much reduced from that included in the previous appeal scheme. It is now of an appropriate size for the roof on which it would be located, is set down from the ridge and up from the eaves. It would not appear as unduly prominent in views from neighbouring properties to the rear.
8. The appeal site adjoins the Crystal Palace Park Conservation Area (CA), which lies opposite the appeal site. The Council do not allege that the proposal would harm the character or appearance of the CA. I agree that any impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of the area, which I consider to be acceptable, would be localised and would not adversely impact on the CA or its setting.
9. I conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptably adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, and would comply with Policy 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019, which, amongst other things, seeks development that complements the scale, proportion, and form of adjacent buildings and areas.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time condition, another listing the submitted plans is required, to provide certainty as to what has been approved. I also agree that a condition requiring matching external materials is needed, to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is preserved.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission should be granted subject to the conditions.

Michael J Muston

INSPECTOR