



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2023 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3320811

16 Fairmead, Bromley BR1 2JU

- 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 Steven Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref: 22/04703/FULL6, dated 28 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey front and side wrap around extension and part one part two side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area, and b) the living conditions of 18 Fairmead, with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. Fairmead is a residential street with generally uniform semi-detached houses. Most properties have retained their original simple form and detailing, consisting of red brick and white PVC windows, however some have been subject to alterations including front porches, and others have been modernised to have rendered facades, grey windows and front, side and rear extensions, most of which with pitched roofs. The appeal site has been subject to a previous front and side extension, which use matching materials, and a pitched roof.
5. The proposed flat roof would appear incongruous with the existing property, particularly on the front and side elevations where it would be most prominent. The flat roof together with the boxy appearance of the extensions would make the proposal appear as an obvious modern addition, the scale of which would not sit comfortably beside the older host dwelling.

6. The materials proposed would also have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Cedar cladding is not a common material seen within Fairmead, and therefore would be at odds with the materials typically found in this street. This, combined with the proposed roof and overall massing of the extensions would constitute a scheme which does not fit into the vernacular on Fairmead, and would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposals are contrary to Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), which seek to ensure high quality design is achieved that fits with the character and appearance of the area.

Living Conditions

7. The rear of the appeal site and those nearby is open, with a sense of space. The footprint of No 18 is set further forward than the appeal site, and as such the existing rear elevation of the site extends beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring house. The proposed rear and side extension, by virtue of its position near to the boundary, would encroach into the outlook of the occupiers of No 18. As such, the extension would result in a harmful sense of enclosure that is not in accordance with the aims of Policies 6 and 37 in the Local plan, which seek to ensure living conditions are maintained.

Other Matters

8. Nos 1, 6, 14, 26 and 34 Fairmead are within the vicinity of the appeal site, however all have pitched roofs and materials that are in keeping with the other properties on the road. Furthermore, the examples maintain a gap between the neighbouring properties, either by stepping the extension, or through being on an angle compared to the neighbouring property. Therefore, in terms of both main issues, the examples provided do not have a bearing on my recommendation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. There is harm found in respect of both the first and second main issue. The conflict this would have with the development plan, given there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight to indicate differently, leads me to recommend the appeal be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representatives' report. I have also been provided with photographs of the appeal site and the surrounding area.
11. The appeal building is located in an area primarily comprised of two storey semi-detached and terraced houses of an essentially similar design, built in brick under pitched, gabled, roofs. Notwithstanding that a number of these houses have been extended or externally rendered, the area nonetheless has a homogeneous appearance.
12. My attention has been drawn to a number of properties which have previously been extended. From the drawings provided, although I recognise that these

illustrate a variety of two storey extensions, these have drawn their design cues and approach from the existing houses. Where existing houses and extensions have been rendered, these still retain the basic design elements of the original building and the surrounding properties and have maintained the approach to the fenestration pattern of the original building.

13. In contrast, the design approach taken by the appeal proposal would introduce several elements which would be visually discordant with both the appeal building and its neighbours, in particular the continuation of the flat roofs beyond the main gable wall and above the existing eaves line, and the introduction of vertical timber cladding, a material not commonly used in the area. In addition, the irregular sizes and placement of the windows on the front elevation of the ground floor extension would be at odds with the approach taken on the neighbouring house and on the other extensions cited. As a result, the house as extended would no longer integrate well with its surroundings. I therefore find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the relevant policies of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 identified above.
14. Whilst I accept the Council's conclusion that the proposed extension would have little effect on outlook and light to the rear of the property at number 18 Fairmead, the appeal proposal would, nevertheless, introduce a tall structure very close to the common boundary between the properties. This would be well beyond the main rear wall of number 18 and adjacent to the area of garden closest to that house. The proposed two storey rear extension would project significantly above the height of the boundary fence and would appear unduly dominant. This would result in the area of garden closest to the house being a less pleasant place for its occupiers to use. I therefore find that the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at 18 Fairmead and would conflict with the relevant policies of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 identified above.
15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR