



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2022

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16/01/2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3305092

2 Inglewood Copse, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2BB

- 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 Ikponmwosa Obayiuwana against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/01374/FULL6, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed first floor front extension and a part two-storey / part single storey rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Bickley Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The significance of the CA primarily derives from the high quality of its mainly residential built form and the mature landscaping often provided within gardens. The wider CA includes some substantial dwellings set within spacious plots. However, the CA also includes smaller dwellings set within more regular sized plots, such as those on Inglewood Copse, where the distinctive design quality and soft landscaped gardens of the residential environment positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. There are some variations in terms of the layout and form of individual dwellings on Inglewood Copse. However, there is general consistency in the architectural style of the dwellings which often include distinctive catslide roofs incorporating dormers. In the cases of the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling at No 3 Inglewood Copse, their catslide roofs and dormers face the street. Together with their matching materials and handed, L-shaped, layouts; these dwellings display a pleasing degree of symmetry which positively contributes to the character and appearance of the street scene and adds to the significance of the CA.
5. The proposal would remove the host dwelling's characteristic catslide roof and dormer. Even accounting for the matching materials proposed, the bulk, form and position of the gable fronted first floor front extension would be a prominent addition which would significantly contrast with the neighbouring catslide roof form at No 3. Consequently, these neighbouring dwellings would

no longer read as a matching pair. This would significantly detract from the order and attractiveness of the street scene on Inglewood Copse. The positive contribution that the symmetry of these properties makes to the CA's built environment would also be lost. Consequently, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to preserve the CA.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to extensions to other dwellings on Inglewood Copse and the wider area. In the latter respect, the examples referred to are on Wellands Close which sits outside the CA boundary. Alterations there, do not justify an erosion of characteristic roof forms on Inglewood Copse within the CA. Where other dwellings on Inglewood Copse have been extended, their design, layout and visual relationship with their nearest neighbours ensures that they sit comfortably within the street scene. Moreover, in most instances, catslide roofs and dormers still form part of the roofscape on those dwellings. Therefore, the examples referred to by the appellant do not persuade me that the site-specific impact of the proposal would be justified.
7. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). Paragraph 200 of the Framework states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.
8. Taking into account the above factors, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
9. There is an extant planning permission on the site¹ which includes the same rear extensions and garage conversion included in the appeal proposal. The existing planning permission demonstrates that those alterations could be provided without the identified harm that would result from the first-floor front extension. The first-floor front extension would provide a bedroom with an en-suite facility. This additional accommodation would result in a private benefit for the occupants of the host dwelling. Consequently, I find that there are not public benefits in this instance that outweigh the less than substantial harm identified having regard to the great weight I must attach to the conservation of the CA.
10. I conclude, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA. In that regard, the development would conflict with the design and conservation requirements of Policies 37 (General Design of Development) and 41 (Conservation Areas) of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019) and the Framework.

¹ LPA ref 21/01058/FUL6

Conclusion

11. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA and therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR