



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3316949
130 Churchfields Road, Beckenham, BR3 4QZ

- 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 Tezcan Koc against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/04049/FULL6, dated 15 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage, part one/two storey front/side extension, relocation of side gate and formation of parking space at rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
3. The proposed side extension would, at first floor at the front of the property, come within 1m of the boundary of the property with Clement Road. Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan states that proposals for side extensions of two storeys should normally have a minimum 1m space from the side boundary for the full height and length of the building, and this may be increased in areas of existing higher standards of separation. The supporting text to the Policy explains the objective is to ensure adequate separation, safeguard privacy and amenity, prevent a cramped appearance and terracing effect, and protect high spatial standards and levels of visual amenity.
4. Although the proposal would not be consistent with the 1m figure contained in this Policy, the scheme would retain a suitable degree of spaciousness and separation for the site. Space would be retained to the boundary, and there is a generally open appearance on this corner site due to the distance retained to the properties to the west, north and south, whilst to the east is a large open area in front of a primary school. The set-back of the extension from the front elevation, and lowered ridge line, assist in ensuring the extension appears subordinate and there would be no cramped appearance or terracing effect.
5. However, the design of the extension at first floor shows an angled wall, which diverges away from the front building line. This creates a design that would be

curiously out of place with the established character of the area, which sees properties of conventional proportions, fronting the regular pattern of streets. The angled wall leads to a skewed appearance to the extended property and roof form, which would be particularly noticeable due to the corner site and long views towards the building from many directions. I saw a number of corner properties in the area at my site visit, including those drawn to my attention by the appellant, and a consistent feature of these is a more regular form to houses.

6. Policies 6 and 37 of the Local Plan require all new development, including extensions, to be of a scale and form that respects the host dwelling and the surrounding area. In this instance, the detailed design and form of the extension at first floor would not satisfy this requirement.
7. The ground floor element of the proposed extension would have no impact on the character of the area due to the limited height and the boundary fence. There would not be any effect on neighbouring amenity due to the position of windows and distance from other properties. However, the design and form of the proposal at first floor leads to conflict with the Policies 6 and 37 of the Local Plan as noted earlier, and this is sufficient to outweigh other matters. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C J Leigh
INSPECTOR