The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2023 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MRTPI MIEMA CEnv

Decision by Chris Forrett MRTPI, DipTP, BSc (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3323384
Pimalai, The Drive, Chislehurst BR7 6QS

- 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 K & M Siva against the decision of Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
- The application Ref DC/22/04061/FULL6, dated 14 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2023.
- The development proposed is a two-storey 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 Issue

3. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Pimalai is a detached two-storey dwelling located at the end of The Drive, a cul-de-sac off Leesons Hill in Chiselhurst. The area to the front of the property largely consists of a block paved driveway/parking area and the existing double garage. There are also two areas of landscaping, between the house and the garage and a largely grassed area between the gravelled shared access and the properties block paved parking area.

5. The distinctive character of the street scene is derived from large, detached houses of varying designs within large plots with trees and other vegetation. This creates a feeling of openness on The Drive. The open character is visible from numerous vantage points along The Drive and the open aspect is an important feature in this low-density urban area. For the most part, the front amenity areas are free from substantial built development.

6. My attention has been drawn to a previous unsuccessful proposal[1] at the site for what I understand was a larger development to the one before me.

[1] Planning application reference 05/02646/FULL6 & appeal ref APP/G5180/A/06/2011229

Notwithstanding that, I have determined the current appeal on its individual merits.

7. The proposed two storey extension would fill the entire gap between the host dwelling and the detached garage and would result in a bulky development which would dominate the head of the cul-de-sac largely owing to its height and width, extending to join up the detached garage. In coming to that view, I acknowledge that the ridge line of the proposal would be below that of the host dwelling. Furthermore, this bulky addition would be detrimental to the appearance of the host property. It would also be at odds with the character of the surrounding area which is largely free of substantial development at the frontages to the properties in the street.

8. The appellant sets out that the character of the area has evolved since the appeal decision in 2006 and have referred to 3 developments in the area that the Council has granted planning permission which also includes two storey front additions. However, I have limited details of these developments and from the information before me none of these are comparable to the proposal before me. Notwithstanding that, nothing that I observed at my site visit provides me with a compelling justification to permit an otherwise unacceptable development.

9. Taking all the above points together, I find that the bulk and height of the proposed two storey extension would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, there would be conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019). These policies amongst other matters seek to ensure that the alteration or enlargement of residential properties respect or complement the scale, form and materials of construction the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area, and space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR