



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3306004

85 Kevington Drive, Chislehurst, Bromley BR7 6RW

- 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 Simon Daley against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/02476/FULL6, dated 20 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is for two storey side/front and single storey rear extension with elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of the development varies between the documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the concise description from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the local area, with reference to spatial characteristics.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached house with good sized front and rear gardens. It sits in an area of similarly scaled detached houses, although there is a variety in their design, with some having undergone significant alteration and/or extension. It is located within the Marlings Park Estate Area of Special Residential Character (the ASRC).
5. The proposal involves the demolition of the existing single storey flat roofed garage and utility room to the side of the appeal dwelling and the construction of a storey side and front extensions and a single storey rear extension, with other elevational alterations to the roof and fenestration. The existing garage and utility room aligns with the ground floor front and rear elevations of the appeal dwelling and reaches to the side boundary of the appeal property with the neighbouring house at 83 Kevington Drive (No.83).
6. The proposed 2 storey side extension would align with the front and rear first floor elevations of the appeal dwelling and would reach to the side Boundary

- with No.83. From the front this would integrate with the existing house and the proposed 2 storey front extension that would result in the house appearing as a significantly larger triple gable fronted house. The existing roof form of the appeal dwelling would be significantly altered to accommodate the proposed 2 storey extensions and would be in a grey tile to replace existing.
7. To the rear of the appeal dwelling and the proposed two storey side extension the proposal includes a single storey flat roofed rear extension that would be to the full width of the appeal dwelling and the proposed two storey side extension. Although large, this rear extension does appear to be of a scale and of a contemporary design that would reflect the type of single storey rear extension to be found in the wider local area.
 8. The width of the existing garage and utility room reaches to the boundary with No.85 and, from my site visit, this form of two storey house with side garage is evidently a form of dwelling that makes up a majority of the housing in the immediate local area. This form of development allows for a significant separating distance between the first floors and roofs of houses, which results in an impression of space between detached houses. This makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the local area and to this part of the ASRC.
 9. The proposal would infill the majority of the existing separating gap at first and roof levels, which would result in the extended appeal dwelling stretching a full two stories across the majority of the width of its plot. This would result in the appeal dwelling appearing as cramped on its site and in its visual relationship with No.83. This would have the effect of the appeal property appearing incongruous within the context of the generously spatially separated detached houses in the local area, which would also not reflect the spatial characteristics of the local area or that of the ASRC.
 10. The appellant has drawn my attention to detached houses with various forms of side extensions, providing only limited detail of location and planning status or age of the extensions. However, approved extensions would have been considered on their own individual merits, and I have done likewise with the proposal, which is a key tenet of the planning system.
 11. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area and the characteristics of the ASRC. This would be in conflict with policies 6, 8, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021). These collectively seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design, integrate with the local area and respect, enhance, and strengthen the special and distinctive qualities of Areas of Special Residential Character.

Conclusion

12. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR