



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 September 2023

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/23/3318606
16 Slades Drive, Chislehurst BR7 6JU

- 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 Miss Gina Haggerty against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/04024/FULL1, dated 11 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey front and rear extensions to existing house and new attached 1 bedroom dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the address of the appeal site varies between documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the address from the Council's decision notice as the site falls entirely within the land at this address.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. 16 Slades Drive (No.16) is a two storey, two bedroomed semi-detached house, with a gabled flank end. To the side an attached side structure with a flat roof, which provides storage space and a covered access passage from the front to the rear garden and the side entrance to No.16 as existing. There is a good sized garden to the rear and to the front is a generous garden space that also provides an off street parking space.
5. No.16 is located on a street of semi-detached houses, which form part of a wider planned estate of houses of similar design and scale, with a unified building line and generous spacing between semi-detached pairs. This provides for a cohesive street scape, where the generous space between semi-detached pairs is a defining spatial characteristic of the street and wider area.
6. The proposal would subdivide the appeal plot, to provide a two storey hipped roof 1 bedroom house, which would be attached on the flank side of No.16. This

- would result in two plots on the appeal site that would be narrower than evident in the local area.
7. At ground level the full width of the proposed dwelling would align with a proposed porch to No.16 and to the rear it would align with a proposed single storey extension. At first floor level the front and rear elevations would align with the existing first floor front and rear elevations of No.16, replacing the existing side structure. This would result in the full depth of the flank elevation of the proposed dwelling being 1 metre from the boundary of No.16 with 18 Slades Drive (No.18).
 8. The architectural expression of the proposed dwelling would generally reflect that of other houses in the local area. However, it would appear narrow compared to the existing semi-detached houses that define much of its established and cohesive character and appearance.
 9. The proposed dwelling would replace the existing small side structure and would be mainly built on an area of the garden to the side and rearward of the existing dwelling. Being two storeys, the proposed dwelling would infill much of the existing space between No.16 and the boundary with No.18, which currently reflects the spatial characteristics of the wider area.
 10. Policy 8 of the Local Plan sets out that for residential development, including extensions, the Council normally requires that for a proposed development of two or more stories, a minimum 1 metre space from the boundary be retained for the full height and length of the building. The proposal achieves this 1 metre separating space to the boundary.
 11. However, policy 8 also states that it is expected that where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, proposals are expected to provide a more generous side space. I have identified that although the existing single storey flat roofed side structure sits close to the boundary with No.18, the established spatial characteristics of the area include generous separating gaps between two storey houses that make up the local area.
 12. The proposal would have a plot significantly narrower than that evident in the local area and would appear significantly narrower than the neighbouring housing that defines the streetscape of the local area. When Combined with the proposed 1m separating space to the boundary with No.18, this would result in the proposed new dwelling appearing constrained compared to its neighbours and a dominating presence in local street views. For these reasons, the proposal would represent an interruption to the established spatial standards and appearance of the existing streetscene and would appear incongruous within the cohesive character of the local area.
 13. The appellant has set out their view that the proposed new dwelling would not read in the streetscene as a new dwelling, but rather an extension to No.16. However, it is a proposal that includes a new dwelling that is before me. Notwithstanding this fact, I also find that the design of the proposed dwelling, which includes a front door and subdivision of the existing plot, would result in it appearing as an additional dwelling and not an extension.
 14. Both the appellant and the Council have made reference to an implemented planning permission for a new attached dwelling at 19 Slade Drive¹ and the

¹ Planning Ref: 04/04722/FULL1

appellant has also drawn my attention to an unimplemented planning permission for an attached dwelling at 21 Slades Drive². From the information before me, these permissions are for dwellings with separating gaps to the neighbouring boundary of 2.45 and 2.8 metres respectively, and plot widths similar to that proposed. These would have been considered on their own merits, which would include having significantly greater separating space to the side boundary than that of the appeal proposal. I have, therefore, only given these nearby approvals moderate weight in my considerations.

15. The appellant has also drawn my attention to an implemented planning permission for a new 2 storey dwelling attached to the flank of 175 Slades Drive (No.175) granted on appeal³. Whilst this permission is for a new dwelling similar in scale and width to the proposed dwelling, No.175 is an end of terrace house located on a generous corner plot, a context significantly different to middle of street semi-detached context of the appeal site. This example does not, therefore, provide a strong precedent for the proposed development and I have given it little weight in my consideration of this appeal.
16. Whilst I appreciate that the appellant has sought in the appeal proposal to overcome the reason for refusal of a previous applications⁴, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own individual merits, which is a main tenet of the planning system.
17. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would result in substantial harm to the established character and appearance of the local area. Consequently, it would not comply with policies 4, 8 and 37 of the of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 the National Planning policy Framework (2023). Collectively these seek development that is of a high design quality, with appropriate separating distances and that integrates with the local area.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

18. Both the Council and the appellant have referred to the delivery of new dwellings in the Council area not meeting the required level. The proposal would result in the public benefit of 1 new dwelling with its own garden and an off street parking space and would be suitable for a small household. Whilst a single dwelling is a small contribution to the housing shortage, such windfall developments do collectively make a significant contribution to new housing in London.
19. However, with the presumption in favour of sustainable development and paragraph 11 of the Framework in mind, I find that the substantial adverse impacts of granting permission on the character and appearance of the local area would demonstrably and significantly outweigh the benefits.
20. The appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR

² Planning Ref: 14/04195/FULL1

³ Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/17/3180271

⁴ Planning Ref: 12/02687/FULL1 and 13/02569/FULL1