



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2024 by N Unwin BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 JANUARY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3349234

80 Cattistock Road, Mottingham, Bromley, London SE9 4AN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Bledar Rexhaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/01937/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as 'replace the existing conservatory with a single storey rear extension & add a first-floor single storey side extension over the existing kitchen'.
-

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 main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property forms a modest two-storey end terrace dwelling set back from the public realm. The area is characterised by groups of terraces comprised of largely homogenous dwellings with respect to their scale and form, resulting in a general uniformity of design and appearance. These groups of terraces have been deliberately designed with a modest gap between one another and achieve an attractive and spacious street scene and the creation of a visual break in the built environment.
5. The appeal dwelling and adjoining terrace sit perpendicular to 82 Cattistock Road (no. 82) with a gap retained between the two terraces permitting views between the built form. The positive effect of this gap from the public realm is further enhanced by the views it grants of mature trees within the rear gardens of the surrounding properties. This creates a pleasing punctuation of vegetation between these two groups of terraces, benefiting the street scene. An existing extension adjoins the side elevation of the appeal property with its single storey flat roof form facilitating subservience to the host dwelling and preserves the visual gap with no. 82.

6. The proposal would involve the addition of a first-floor to the existing side extension. The proposed side extension would appear as a substantial form of development, projecting significantly beyond the end elevation of the host dwelling at first-floor level. The lack of fenestration within the front elevation would create an imposing blank façade, unbalancing the existing modest form of the appeal property and its contribution to the characteristic uniformity of the adjoining terrace. The use of similar materials, and minor setback of the front elevation and reduction in ridge height would be insufficient to offset the dominating scale of the proposed side extension. It would additionally erode the existing gap at first-floor level with no. 82, restricting views between the groups of terraces from the public realm. As such, the proposal would harmfully reduce the existing open character present between buildings and subsequently the attractive spaciousness of the built environment which forms an important characteristic of the street scene.
7. I note that the proposal would additionally involve the replacement of the existing conservatory with a single storey rear extension of a similar scale. The Council raise no objection to this element of the proposal and based on the evidence before me, I concur with the Council on this matter.
8. Accordingly, the proposal as a whole would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area, conflicting with the relevant provisions of Policies 6, 8, and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019), which when read together require new development to respect or maintain space or gaps between buildings, and be of a scale and form that respects or compliments the host dwelling.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the proposal would provide additional living space for future occupants, this factor would not outweigh the above identified unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, I am not convinced that an alternative form of development which would provide the required accommodation could not be achieved without giving rise to the extent of harm I have found.
10. The appellant has suggested that design modifications and landscaping could be utilised to ensure the proposal harmonised with the surrounding area. However, I have not been presented with any details of what this might entail and have determined the appeal on the basis of the information available. In any event, I am not convinced that minor amendments to the design of the proposal or landscaping would overcome the unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR