



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3290910

16 Alexandra Crescent, Bromley BR1 4EU

- 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 Swider and Piraino against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/03372/FULL6, dated 2 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to the existing semi-detached house at ground and first floor level to the side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - The character and appearance of the host property and the area; and
 - The living conditions of the adjacent occupiers at 14 and 18 Alexandra Crescent, with particular regards to outlook and overshadowing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The host comprises a semi-detached two storey property, whose front face is finished with 'Mock Tudor' timber detailing and render above ground floor masonry. Its style and fenestration are broadly consistent with its attached neighbour at No. 14, and with the adjacent semi-detached pair at Nos. 18 and 20, which together form a small cohesive group.
4. Elsewhere along Alexandra Crescent the dwellings are predominantly two storeys high, but display a range of facing materials, and have a varied form and appearance. Whilst they are set back a similar distance from the road, some abut their side boundaries at ground or first floor level, whilst others are set in.
5. The scheme's first floor wall would be set back behind the dwelling's front face. However, its very large studio window with combined rooflight would be in a markedly different style to the host. As a result of that, together with its eaves line which would extend above the existing eaves line, the scheme would clash

with, and dominate the host property. The overall effect in the streetscene would be a very eclectic appearance.

6. According to the Council's calculations, the first floor side extension would be set in 0.8 metre from the side boundary, thus below the minimum 1 metre distance normally required by Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 ('BLP'). However, given the varied siting of dwellings relative to their side boundaries in Alexandra Crescent, that would not result in a cramped appearance. Consequently, the scheme would not conflict with the thrust of BLP Policy 8, nor with BLP Policy 6's requirement at Part b for extensions to respect or maintain gaps between buildings where these contribute to the character of the area.
7. Given the varied appearance of the rear faces of dwellings in the area, their diverse materials, and their secluded setting amongst landscaping, the proposed rear extensions would not appear out of place. Whilst it would protrude slightly above the ridgeline, the proposed chimney would be a modestly proportioned feature.
8. Nevertheless, in the streetscene the scheme's design would jar markedly with the existing dwelling, its attached neighbour, and the adjacent semi-detached pair, and it would thus significantly harm the character and appearance of the host and the area. As a result, it would conflict with BLP Policy 6 Part a and BLP Policy 37 which, in general terms, require a high standard of design that contributes positively to the streetscene, and which require an extension's scale, form and materials to respect the host and the area.

Living conditions

9. The long two storey rear extension would be centrally located, and would be set well in from this wide plot's side boundaries. Consequently, it would only be seen in fairly oblique views from the rear faces of No 14 and No 18, and it would not impact those occupiers' outlook to a harmful degree.
10. The proposed single storey rear extension, which would have a relatively modest height and depth, and the two storey side extension, would be set in slightly from the side boundary with No 18. The nearest ground floor window in No 18 is also set in from the boundary, and beyond it that property has a large conservatory with an outlook down its wide rear garden. For those reasons, those extensions would not have a significant overbearing impact on the occupiers of No 18.
11. Finally, as the rear extensions would be located on the host's northern elevation, having regard to the sun's trajectory, and on the basis of the available evidence, they would not cause significant overshadowing.
12. The scheme would not harmfully impact adjacent occupiers' living conditions. On this issue, it would not therefore conflict with BLP Policies 8 and 37 which, amongst other things, require adequate space around extensions in order to safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents, and which seek to ensure that their amenity is not harmed as a result of matters such as overshadowing. As BLP Policy 6 addresses matters of character and appearance, it is of little relevance on this issue.

Conclusions

13. Summing up, whilst the scheme would not harmfully impact adjacent occupiers' living conditions, it would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area, contrary to the development plan. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR