The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2023

by J Pearce MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3327254
2 Canterbury Close, Bromley, Beckenham BR3 5EP

- 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 Mrs Bejan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
- The application Ref DC/23/01520/FULL6, dated 18 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2023.
- The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and new boundary wall.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note that the enlargement of the garden of the appeal site would constitute a material change of use of the land to the rear, which would be bounded by the proposed boundary wall. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development, with particular regard to the proposed boundary wall, on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises an end-of terrace dwelling fronting Canterbury Close. The rear of the site addresses The Avenue and is separated from the road by a grassed verge and footway. The surrounding area has a spacious feel, derived from the verge and mature street trees, giving a verdant character. The area is typified by its modern and varied architecture, which provides opportunities for development of differing styles to assimilate appropriately within and positively contribute to the street scene.

5. Boundary treatments in the locality are varied and include high brick walls, timber fences and lower brick walls with railings and hedges. The higher brick walls, which are found on either side of The Avenue, abut the back edge of the footways reducing the space on both sides of the road. The exception to this a short stretch of land, which lies to the rear of several properties on Canterbury Close, including the appeal property, where the stepped arrangement of the boundary walls allow the space to open out towards the junction with Canterbury Close. The area of this land to the immediate rear of the appeal property is currently overgrown and subject to littering from passers-by.

6. The proposals include the erection of a boundary wall built to the back edge of the footway of The Avenue and Canterbury Close, incorporating the existing space into the rear garden. The proposed wall would reduce the space to the rear of the site. Although, the footway and verge would remain, the proposal would significantly reduce the openness of the area. Furthermore, the stepped back nature of the walls adjacent to the site would make the proposed wall appear particularly prominent, protruding significantly from the line of the existing boundary.

7. Although the wall would replicate the design, materials and siting of other walls abutting the back edge of the footway, and would assist in providing security, it would be discordant within the surroundings and have a negative visual effect on the locality.

8. I conclude that the proposed development would have harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. On this basis, the proposal conflicts with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan, which requires proposals to be of a high standard of design and positively contribute to the existing street scene.

Other Matters

9. The proposed single storey rear extension would be of a complementary flat roof design with matching materials, suitable fenestration and subservient proportions. It would, therefore, assimilate appropriately with the character and appearance of the host property and the area, with only limited views from public vantage points due to the screening afforded by boundary treatments.

10. The extension would be located close to the side boundary with No 4 Canterbury Close. However, the combination of its limited depth beyond an extension to the neighbouring property and absence of windows in the facing elevation would ensure no unacceptable impact on the living conditions of occupiers of that neighbouring property, with respect to outlook, light or privacy.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, which would indicate that a decision should be made otherwise. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Pearce

INSPECTOR