



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 DECEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3298689

1 Greencourt Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1QL

- 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 Harry Agent against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/05213/FULL6, dated 29 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 February 2022.
 - The development is a replacement front garden boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement front garden boundary wall at 1 Greencourt Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1QL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/21/05213/FULL6, dated 29 October 2021, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the application form is "Replacement front garden boundary wall. Retrospective". As the term retrospective does not relate to an act of development, I have omitted this from the description.
3. The front garden boundary wall has been completed in accordance with the submitted drawings.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The site is located in the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC), which is described in the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (January 2019) (the Local Plan), as having an open, suburban and semi-rural feel, predicated by low boundaries and visible front gardens.
6. Greencourt Road is a predominantly residential street comprising traditional houses set back from the highway. The houses in this area are typically a mixture of brick and white painted render, beneath a red clay tile roof. Front boundary treatments consist of low level walls and planting. The boundary walls vary significantly in terms of materials and include stone, artificial stone, brick and render. Directly opposite the appeal site there is a church yard, with a low brick boundary wall, which steps up in line with the topography of the street.

7. The appeal property is white rendered with some brick detailing. It is evident from the information before me that its front garden was previously enclosed by a low stone wall with higher level planting behind it.
8. The replacement boundary wall is finished in white painted render, which is commonly used in this area and matches the dwelling. Although slightly higher than the previous wall, it's low height, which steps up in line with the ground level, retains the open feel and visibility of the front garden, in keeping with the ASRC.
9. The development reflects the character and appearance of the area and therefore accords with Policies 37 and 44 of the Local Plan, which seek amongst other things to ensure that development is of a high standard that respects, enhances and strengthens the special and distinctive qualities of the ASRC.
10. I have not been provided with a copy of the Article 4 Direction for the Petts Wood ASRC. However, such directions are not development plan policies against which development should be assessed. They are a method of removing permitted development rights, in order to manage development in a positive way.

Conditions

11. As the development has already been completed and is in accordance with the submitted drawings, no conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR