



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2022

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3307753

The Robins, 4A Woodlands Road, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2AE

- 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 McDonald against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
- The application Ref 22/01673/FULL6, dated 21 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2022.
- The development proposed is described as the introduction of single storey front garage projection of brickwork construction to match existing dwelling with design incorporating a green sedum roof, recessed balcony with glass balustrade and replacement of window above existing garage with glazed doors.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension to garage with recessed balcony and glass balustrade and replacement of window above existing garage with glazed doors at The Robins, 4A Woodlands Road, Bickley, Bromley, BR1 2AE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01673/FULL6, dated 21 April 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed East Elevation (Right) – Drawing Number TP(11)20; Proposed North Elevation (Front) – Drawing Number TP(11)21; Proposed West Elevation (Left) – Drawing Number TP(11)22; Proposed Site Plan – Drawing Number TP(01)04; Proposed Site Location Plan – Drawing Number TP(01)02; Proposed Section AB – Drawing Number TP(12)20.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) No development, including the arrival of machinery, materials and any preparatory works, shall take place until the tree protective fencing as shown on Quaife Woodlands Arboricultural Survey AR/4160a/jq (12 July 2022) has been implemented in accordance with the submitted details. The protective fencing shall remain at all times for the duration of the works.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bickley Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a large detached dwelling set in spacious grounds. It is located in the Bickley Park Conservation Area (BPCA) which is characterised as forming an area of large dwellings set in spacious grounds within a verdant setting.
4. The appeal property has an attached triple garage to the side of the main body of the dwelling. It is proposed to extend the existing garage in a forward direction. The development would incorporate a curved door, a terrace with glass balustrade over part of the flat roof with a sedum roof over the remaining part of the roof.
5. I observed on my site visit that a number of nearby properties have garages that are sited forward of the main part of the host property in a manner similar to the proposed development. This has also been demonstrated in the appellant's evidence. The Council highlight that these were constructed as part of the original design of those dwellings, however, they are nevertheless characteristic of some properties close to the appeal site that are also within the BPCA.
6. The proposed development would not significantly obscure the principal part of the main front elevation of the dwelling and a substantial front garden area would remain. Thus, the development would retain the spacious character of the property. The development would incorporate the lower-level brick detailing and chamfered edge that is used in the main body of the dwelling. Although incorporating a somewhat unconventional curved garage door, this would sit comfortably and reflect the curvature of the large bay windows used in two prominent sections of the main body of the dwelling.
7. For the reasons above, I do not consider that the siting or design of the proposed garage would represent an incongruous or a discordant feature. It would not be detrimental to the appearance of the host property or the character and appearance of the BPCA.
8. The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) for Bickley Park Conservation Area (1998) identifies that within the BPCA some houses have purpose-built detached garages recessed behind the principal building. Where new garages are proposed, similar recessing should be employed. Any new garages should be constructed in materials and adopting details that are compatible with host and adjacent buildings.
9. The proposed development would be an extension to the existing building as opposed to a new detached building. Although the proposed development would conflict with the SPG in terms of it not being recessed behind the principal building, for the reasons given above it is not considered that there would be harm caused from this conflict. The proposed garage adopts details and materials that would be compatible with the host building.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development does not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the BPCA. It would comply with

Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) and policies D3 and HC1 of The London Plan 2021. Collectively, these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality design that conserves or enhances the historic environment.

11. There is some conflict with the element of Policy 41 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), which requires that new development preserves and enhances the characteristics and appearance of conservation areas. I do not consider that the proposed development enhances the characteristics and appearance of the BPCA as such, but I do conclude that it has a neutral impact on, and thereby preserves, the character and appearance of the BPCA.
12. The proposed development would also comply with the requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) that development is of high-quality design, and that heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, and that when considering the impact of a development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Other Matters

13. Reference is made to other extensions at the property. These are to the rear of the dwelling and would not be seen in conjunction with the development subject to the appeal. Based on the evidence before me I do not find that there would be cumulative harm caused.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the host property, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of matching materials.
15. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring that the retained trees are protected during construction of the development.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR