



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2022

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3306889
59 Wickham Way, Beckenham, BR3 3AH

- 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 Ms C McCarthy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/02140/FULL6, dated 26 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear and side extension to dwelling involving removal of existing single storey side additions; provision of accommodation within roof space to be served by rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey rear and side extension to dwelling involving removal of existing single storey side additions; provision of accommodation within roof space to be served by rear dormer at 59 Wickham Way, Beckenham, BR3 3AH in accordance with the terms of the application ref DC/22/02140/FULL6, dated 26 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P1A, P2A, P3A & P4A.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Park Langley Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within the Park Langley Conservation Area, where I have a duty under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Area.
 4. The Park Langley Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2002 explains this residential area was conceived on Garden City principles in
-

the early 20th Century, and development proceeded on this basis until the interruption by WWI. This early period of development shows a strong character of housing that adheres to original principles of the Estate. The post-War development that occurred still demonstrates the character of large houses in spacious plots, with landscaping to provide the verdant, low-density layout of houses. The significance of the Area as a heritage asset derives from the spacious character, extensive landscaping and the high quality of individual houses within that setting.

5. The appeal property is a late part of the Park Langley Estate development, with map evidence shown to me demonstrating the house was built on a plot that remained vacant until the late 1930s. The house is typical of a high-quality suburban home of that time with its setting, use of materials and relationship to the plot having an appearance that sits comfortably within the character of the wider Estate. The property therefore contributes positively to the Conservation Area.
6. The proposed development would see additions to the rear, side and front of the house. The SPG states that the spacious layout of the Estate provides scope for sensitively-designed extensions, provided any extensions do not dominate the host building or significantly alter the spatial characteristics of the road; rear extensions are preferred, but the SPG does not preclude other extensions. The proposals in this appeal, whilst large, adhere to these principles. The character, appearance and form of the original property would be retained, with the extensions being clearly seen as additions to that house: the gabled roof would be extended in length as seen in the front elevation, whilst the rearward projections would see twin gables with a set-down ridge and pitched roof. The new gable to the front would similarly recede in scale and form.
7. The overall impression of the property would be, although larger, a well-balanced house where the original architectural approach of the property is respected and retained. The extended house would also remain suitably proportioned to the plot, with the landscape setting retained.
8. In making my observations I note the examples of development in the area that the appellant has drawn to my attention, with evidence provided to me demonstrating that the Council have permitted notable extensions at houses that appear of generally similar appearance to No. 59. There have also been replacement houses and new properties in close proximity to the appeal site, with those new buildings of a different form and design to the prevailing inter-War appearance of housing in the area. These have been permitted within the Conservation Area, and hence demonstrate to me that the Council accept such change satisfies the guidance regarding new development within their SPG, as well as the statutory test under s72. These changes permitted by the Council are a matter in favour of the changes sought by the appellant as they illustrate how the Conservation Area has evolved in recent years.
9. I therefore find that the extended property would remain of a high quality appearance that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the wider Conservation Area, and that the spacious character of that Area would not be harmed. Thus, there would not be any harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The proposals are consistent with Policy D4 of the London

Plan 2021 and Policies 4 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019, which seek a high standard of design in new development proposals including housing development. The proposals are also consistent with Policy HC1 of the London Plan and Policy 41 of the Local Plan that require development in conservation areas to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of such areas, and the guidance in the SPG.

10. The appeal is therefore allowed. I have attached a condition requiring matching materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development. A condition specifying the approved plans is attached in the interest of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR