



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022 by T Bennett BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3298154

30 Rose Walk, West Wickham, BR4 0SD

- 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 Thomas Bryce against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref 21/03512/FULL6, dated 10 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of conservatory and ground floor side extension with new double storey side and ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The appellant has drawn attention to an error between the first floor plan and the front elevation plan, in that the floor plan incorrectly includes a bay window. The appellant has confirmed that this should be a flat window as per the elevation detail and it is clear that the Council determined the application on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The Council has no concerns in respect of the proposed ground floor rear extension and I find no reason to disagree. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling in a prominent corner position at the junction of Rose Walk and Linden Leas. The site sits within an established residential area comprising sets of terraces similar to the appeal property.
6. On the opposite side of the junction to the appeal site, 32 Rose Walk is set back from the boundary along Linden Leas and has no side extension. The appeal property currently has a small single-storey extension which is set back

from the boundary. Taken together with the wide road, the junction of Rose Walk and Linden Leas has a spacious appearance which is a characteristic and positive feature of several corner plots in the locality.

7. The two-storey side extension would replace the existing small single-storey side extension, extending 4m from the flank elevation. It would be set marginally back from the front elevation, with a lower ridge line and matching roof form and materials to the host property and so appearing subservient.
8. However, the flank elevation of the proposed two-storey extension would be in close proximity to the boundary along Linden Leas. It would exceed the 1 metre requirement set out in Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) (LP) but the wording of the policy states *at least 1 metre* indicating an element of discretion depending on the site context.
9. In this case, despite an approximate distance of 18m to No 32, I consider that the spacing provided would not be sufficient to respect the street scene and wider area. This is because the two storey nature of the proposal, in combination with its close proximity to the boundary, would make the extension appear prominent in views along Rose Walk towards the junction. This would unduly affect and diminish the open character currently experienced at this location, harming the character and appearance of the area where side extensions on corner plots are predominantly single storey or set further back from the boundary.
10. The appellant has drawn attention to five other properties in the vicinity which have had two-storey side extensions, the impact of which I carefully considered and observed on my site visit. At the opposite end of the terrace, 20 Rose Walk is not in a prominent corner position so is not the same context as the appeal property. Whilst the example of 2 Linden Leas is not subservient in nature, it is not as close to the side boundary as the proposal.
11. At 31 Rose Walk and 9 Glebe Way, the first floors are set in from the ground floor, which reduces the extensions' prominence and retains more of an open character. Whilst 102 Silver Lane is similar in design to the proposal and is in a corner position, the property is angled and set much further back from the road and retains more space to the side of the property. These factors reduce the extension's impact on the street scene. Consequently, the examples provided do not change my findings in respect of the proposal.
12. In conclusion, the two-storey side extension would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with LP Policies 6 and 37 which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that space or gaps which contribute to the character of the area are maintained.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The proposed development does not accord with the development plan and there are no other considerations that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Bennett

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

David Smith

INSPECTOR