



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2022

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/21/3279809

101 Beddington Road, Orpington BR5 2TE

- 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 Singh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref 21/00637/FULL1, dated 3 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of existing garage and construction of a two storey 3 bedroom dwelling with associated parking and dropped kerb to both new and existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 101 Beddington Road is an end terrace two storey dwellinghouse of redbrick and brown tile construction. The terraces are of broadly equal size and while some roofs step down between dwellings to manage the changing ground levels, each individual roof has a consistent height. No 101 sits in a prominent corner plot at a crossroads where the road splits into 3 cul-de-sacs. Given its corner location, No 101 has garden space to its side as well as its front and rear. A single storey garage also sits directly adjacent to the house.
4. The wider character of the area is made up of semi-detached and terraced rows of two storey gable ended properties. Red brick is the predominant material however some dwellings have been rendered. At this crossroads there is an open character stemming from the open land on all four corners of the crossroads. This open land makes a positive contribution to the character of the area.
5. It is proposed to demolish the existing garage and erect a two-storey side extension to No 101. This side extension would form a 3-bedroom dwelling and it would extend significantly into the open area of land to the side of No 101.
6. The proposed development would have similar materials to surrounding houses and would initially match No 101's front and rear building lines. However, the constraints of the plot would cause it to substantially taper from the existing rear building line as it extends away from No 101. The tapered nature of the

proposed development would create a roof design of several different styles, which would stepdown in ridge height twice as it extends away from No 101. This tapered built form and contrived roof design would be visible from Beddington Road.

7. The proposed development would also be of a much greater width than the front elevations of the existing terraced houses. This width together with its tapered form and awkward and incoherent combination of roof styles would create a development which would not appear sympathetic to the row of terraced houses it would adjoin or the character and appearance of the wider area.
8. Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (the Local Plan) states that a minimum distance of 1 metre is normally required to side boundaries. However, it also states that where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space. Given the quality of spaciousness, as set out above, and its prominent location, the significant incursion of the proposed development into the open land at the crossroads would be harmful to the open and spacious pattern of development.
9. While the external garden space around the dwelling would be located to the front, side and more modestly to the rear of the property, the Council confirm it would meet minimum standards. The drawings indicate it would be enclosed and would provide outdoor space which is private and appropriate for passive recreation, external drying of clothes or entertaining, amongst other things. Accordingly, I do not consider the garden layout to be out of character with the surrounding pattern of development. However, the absence of harm here does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. I have also had regard to a previous application which was granted at No 101¹. However, this previous proposal does not spread as far into the open corner plot as the proposed development and the roof design of the previous proposal is more similar and sympathetic to the host dwelling. The planning history, therefore, does not outweigh the harm identified above.
11. While the proposal would accord with internal and external space standards and would have dedicated parking facilities and refuse storage facilities, the absence of harm in this regard does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
12. The parties have referred to policies D1, D4 and D6 of the London Plan 2021, the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1 - General Design Principles and SPG2 - Residential Design Guidance, The Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance, numerous paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the National Design Guide and the Planning Practice Guidance in the appeal documentation. While I have considered these, they do not alter my findings.
13. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies 4, 8, and 37 of the Local Plan which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.

¹ 19/04773/FULL6 for a two storey side extension

Planning Balance

14. The main parties agree that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. The Council refers to 3.31 years' supply, while the appellant considers it to be around 3.27 years, based on the housing land supply findings in a recent appeal for 254 housing units, including affordable housing. Notwithstanding the difference in terms of the shortfall, paragraph 11 of the Framework should therefore be applied.
15. Paragraph 60 of the Framework refers to 'boosting significantly' the supply of housing and the submissions from both parties confirm there is a significant undersupply of housing. The provision of one net additional unit consistent with M4 (2) of Building Regulations would make a modest contribution in this context. I also accept this is in an urban area where access to facilities is likely to be greatest and Policy H2 of the London Plan supports development on small sites. I also note the absence of technical objections on highways and drainage.
16. While I afford the benefits modest weight, the harm to the character and appearance of the area as identified above would be significant and I consider that the benefits would not outweigh this significant harm. As a result, the environmental role of sustainable development would not be achieved. When assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Therefore, the proposal would not be a sustainable form of development. The conflict with the development plan is not outweighed by other considerations including the Framework. Furthermore, the imposition of planning conditions or planning obligations would not overcome this harm.

Other Matters

17. Neighbours have raised concerns in respect to parking, outlook, pollution, privacy, and light. Given my overall findings, there is no need for me to consider these matters further.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR