



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/21/3287856

1 Southborough Road, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2EA

- 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 Mrs Deborah Scarborough against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/03294/FULL6, dated 26 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension comprising of two bedrooms, one with en suite.
-

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 property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies on the corner of Southborough Road and Bickley Park Road. The buildings around the junction, and along Southborough Road, are typically set back from the highway, although sometimes at an angle to it. As a result, whilst there are some tall boundary walls next to the pavement near the site, such as at Bickley Park School, the area has a generally spacious character.
4. The site lies just beyond conservation areas, but within an area designated in the Bromley Local Plan 2019 ('BLP') as the Bickley Area of Special Residential Character ('ASRC'), which it describes as comprising spacious development with large houses on substantial plots.
5. The proposed extension would be located above a ground floor projection which lies parallel to Southborough Road. According to the Council's calculations, it would be within about 2 metres of the plot boundary. Consequently, its long first floor wall and its tall gable, along with its end elevations, would be highly visible in streetscene views above the boundary fence and hedgerows. Given its height, mass, length and siting, the scheme would jar with the area's generally much more spacious character.

6. Although the proposed wall cladding with blackened timber boarding would contrast with the light brickwork on the existing dwelling, and would thereby serve to clearly distinguish the scheme from the host building, it would also draw the eye to, and highlight, the scheme's bulk and scale on this prominent corner plot.
7. As the scheme's two storey, long elevation would be very close to, and parallel with, the highway boundary, it differs from the appellant's submitted photographs of nearby development. Additionally, the boundary wall next to the pavement on the opposite side of Southborough Road is significantly lower than this proposed development, and the building behind it is angled away from the road, such that it has a much more limited impact on the area's spaciousness.
8. For those reasons, the scheme would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Thus it would conflict with BLP Policies 6, 8 and 37 which, amongst other things, require a high standard of design that contributes positively to the streetscene; require standards of separation appropriate to the existing context; and which require an extension's scale, form, layout and materials to respect the host and the area.
9. Given that the site is within the ASRC, the scheme would also conflict with BLP Policy 44 which requires development to respect, enhance and strengthen its special and distinctive qualities.
10. Whilst the scheme would improve the living conditions for the host's occupants, that benefit does not outweigh the harm that it would cause. The scheme would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR