



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2022

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29/04/2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/21/3282580

78-80 The Parade, Croydon Road, Beckenham BR3 4DF

- 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 Nigel Broome against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/00231/FULL1, dated 5 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'erection of first and second floor extension, demolition of existing rear store, elevational alterations and part change of use from Class B1(a) to C3 comprising 2x1 bed flats and 2x2 bed flats within the existing and extended first and second floor, retention of the ground floor office space with internal alterations, formation of amenity balconies at first and second floor levels to serve the residential flats and provision of cycle and refuse storage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No 78-80 The Parade is situated on Croydon Road close to the well-trafficked junction with Elmers End Road. It sits at one end of a commercial parade which occupies a prominent street frontage position and also incorporates Nos 74 and 76 Croydon Road. The appeal building has a two-storey element to the rear. However, the front of the parade is single storey and has a flat roof with a common parapet roof line facing the street. No 78-80 also has a distinctive front façade incorporating brick column detailing and evenly proportioned windows.
4. The neighbouring buildings at Elmers Lodge and 70 Croydon Road are three-storey residential buildings with pitched roofs. A two-storey terrace, with mainly commercial uses at ground floor and residential units above, faces the site on Croydon Road. Overall, there is variation in the scale and architecture of buildings in the area. However, the detailing and proportions of individual buildings are generally of a cohesive design which gives order to the street scene.
5. Raising the parapet to create a first floor would disrupt the common parapet roof line on the parade. The depth of the first floor front elevation would have a squat appearance relative to the other floors of the extended building. The windows at first floor level would appear much smaller than those at ground

floor level and this would emphasise the disparity in proportions. Seen alongside the considerable bulk, mass and height of the mansard roof, the varied proportions of individual floors would not result in a cohesive design. As a result, the proposal would unbalance the front elevation of the host building and the wider parade to the detriment of the street scene.

6. My attention has been drawn to the planning history of the site including a previously approved scheme¹ which included amongst other things the provision of an extended first-floor by way of a mansard roof. However, that particular scheme retained the existing parapet level and the mansard roof in that instance was more modest in height. Therefore, I am not persuaded that the effect of the proposal on the balance of the host building's front elevation or that of the wider parade is comparable to the fall-back of this extant planning permission.
7. I conclude, the proposal would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard it would conflict with the requirements for development to be of a high standard of design, to respect local character and enhance local context in Policies 4 (Housing Design) and 37 (General Design of Development) of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019) and Policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) of The London Plan (2021).

Other Matters

8. The appellant suggests that if the appeal scheme were permitted, there may be the potential that the neighbouring properties at Nos 74 and 76 Croydon Road could be extended in a similar way. However, I cannot be certain that such development proposals would come forward and this would not in any case overcome my concerns in respect of the effect of the proposal on the balance of the front elevation of the host building.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

9. The delegated report indicates that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and no substantive evidence has been provided to suggest this situation has changed since the Council issued its decision. In the circumstances, paragraph 11d of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged. Planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.
10. In the context of the Government objective to significantly boost the delivery of housing, four flats would make a modest but important contribution towards the provision and mix of housing in the area. I also attach positive weight to the site's accessible location within close range to services and facilities as well as the potential for some modest economic benefits through the construction works and the expenditure in the area by future occupants.
11. However, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In this respect the development would conflict with the development plan and national policy. This is a matter which significantly and

¹ LPA Ref 20/02745/FULL3

demonstrably outweighs the modest benefits of the proposal when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole.

12. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR