



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2022

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27TH June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/21/3275189

64 Broomfield Road, Bexleyheath DA6 7PB

- 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 J Rose against the decision of the London Borough of Bexley Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03017/FUL, dated 17 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage/home office in front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the of the local area with reference to street scene.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the description of the development varies between the documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice, as this more accurately describes the development and has also been used by the appellant in their statement.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two storey semidetached house, on a corner location at the junction of Broomfield Road and Faygate Crescent. It has with a wide front garden with some off-street parking. It is neighboured by similar semi-detached properties that face across the street onto a large open green area.
5. The proposal is for 10m by 6.4m single storey detached garage and home office with a shallow hipped roof, which would be located in that part of the wide front garden that sits to one side of the house. This part of the garden sits behind a front hedge. The proposal would be approximately 2.25m to its eaves and 3.65m to the apex of the pitched roof. The proposal would sit with a narrower side without any openings facing onto the street, with its vehicle and pedestrian entrance door facing on to the off-street parking area, which sits directly in front of the house. The proposed garage element would be to the front of the proposal, to the rear of this and accessed through the garage would be the home office area and toilet space.

6. From my site visit, it is clear that the front gardens of residential properties in the area, including that of the appeal site, are free of separate garages and outbuildings. These are generally evident as only being in either the rear garden, or to the side of the dwellings on the properties. This results in the area having a coherent character and appearance to its street scene, defined by its unencumbered front gardens enclosed by hedges and trees. This verdant character is particularly strong where the properties, like the appeal property, face on to the large green opposite.
7. The proposal would be approximately as wide as the semidetached house and would take up nearly half of the front garden area. Although it would sit behind the front garden hedge it would be visible from the street, interrupting and sitting forward of the existing coherent building line. Given the corner location, this would result in the proposal appearing prominently in views of the local area, from both the street and the green opposite.
8. Although it would be in materials that would match the existing house, due to its scale and its location at the front of the corner site, the proposal would appear unduly prominent in street views, interrupting the established pattern of development and concomitant street scene. The proposal would also infill a large area of front garden space that would detract from the verdant character of the local area. As a result, the proposal would appear as dominating and incongruous and, therefore, detrimental to the streetscene of the area.
9. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. This would conflict with saved policies ENV39 and H3 of the Bexley Unitary Development Plan (2004), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which collectively seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design and integrates with the local area.

Other Matters

10. Although the council has expressed the view that approval of the proposal would potentially set a precedent, this is not a matter for my consideration. It is a fundamental of the planning process that each proposal should be considered on its own individual merits, that is what I have done in this instance.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR