



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2023

by R Lawrence MRTPI, BSc (hons), PGDip (TP)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3317668

20 The Avenue, West Wickham BR4 0DY

- 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 Keith Daniels against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/04791/FULL6, dated 5 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is roof extension of existing detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The roof extension to the garage has been substantially constructed, although it is not complete, and I am therefore considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area
 - Whether the proposal results in an adverse effect on the outlook of the occupiers of No 22 The Avenue

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The Avenue is a residential road, primarily made up of semi-detached two-storey properties of a similar size and scale. The appeal property is not listed and does not fall within a Conservation Area. In the vicinity of the appeal site there is consistency in terms of the architectural style of properties and gaps between the pairs of houses. Outbuildings in rear gardens are a common feature in the area, with the very top of the roofs often visible from the street. The gaps between houses, generally at first floor level, enable views of soft landscaping to the rear of the houses.
5. The extended garage is subordinate in height to the host dwelling as well as surrounding properties, however, the height of the extended garage results in it partially obscuring an upper floor window leading to a bulky appearance. The original roof form of the garage, specifically the eaves, remain visible beneath the extended roof, this gives a clumsy appearance to the building. The extended roof features a very shallow roof pitch which is out of character with the steeper roof pitches seen in the surrounding area. The use of different materials on the elevations of the extended garage, compared with the original

garage, draw further attention to the building. The use of upvc cladding does not reflect materials used on the host property and further detracts from the visual appearance of the garage.

6. The detached garage building is set back from the host property; whilst this minimises the prominence of the garage it would nonetheless be visible from the main road given its height. As such, views to/from the garden of the host property and the street are partially obscured with the partial loss of a characteristic gap at first floor level between properties. Due to its set back position, the proposal would not alter the alignment of front elevations in the street scene, however, it would be visible beyond and would detract the eye. I accept that the views of the garage building from the street would be limited, however, for the above reasons there would nonetheless be an adverse effect.
7. Whilst there are other examples of outbuildings/garages in rear gardens, the roofs of these are of a much smaller scale and do not appear visible in the street scene in a harmful manner. I therefore consider that the extended garage appears unduly bulky and materially detracts from the character and appearance of the area.
8. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan January 2019 (LP) which in general terms seek to ensure that development, including extensions, achieves a high standard of design which is compatible with development in the surrounding area.

Outlook of occupiers of No 22

9. The extended garage sits in close proximity to the boundary with No 22 The Avenue, adjacent to a rear patio area. The original garage would have been visible from No 22, however the lower height and reduced bulk at roof level enabled outlook above and beyond the garage from the rear patio area and rear ground floor windows. The height and overall scale of the extended garage would obscure that outlook and given the proximity to the boundary, would result in an overbearing impact. The proposal would therefore adversely impact upon the outlook of No 22.
10. The appeal scheme is therefore in conflict with Policy 37 of the LP which includes a requirement to respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Conclusion

11. The appeal scheme would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other matters which indicate that planning permission should be granted. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Lawrence

INSPECTOR