



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/24/3353295

21 St. Georges Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1JB

- 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 Mr and Mrs Exall against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/02198/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as the re-construction of existing wall fronting highway to accommodate in & out drive as crossover application. Crossover construction job no: 589510.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the front boundary brick wall with 2 metal electric vehicular and pedestrian access gates and additional vehicular access at 21 St. Georges Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1JB in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. DC/24/02198/FULL6, subject to the development hereby permitted being carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PP-13135196v1; 1018/509; and 1018/510A.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. For the purposes of this decision, and in the interest of preciseness, I have used the description from the decision notice and appeal form.
4. From the appeal documentation and my site visit I note that the proposed development has already partly been carried out. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site forms a single storey detached dwelling set back from the highway. The appeal site is located within the Petts Wood Area of Special

Residential Character (ASRC) which the Council describes as having an open feel, predicated by low boundaries. This section of the ASRC exhibits a range of boundary treatments with walls and fences adjoining the highway being relatively low level affording the street scene an attractive wide and capacious character. Prior to the implementation of the proposed works, the boundary comprised a low brick wall contributing to the openness of the street scene.

7. The proposed development forms a red brick wall currently in situ, with gates yet to be installed. The proposal represents a modest increase in height of the existing boundary treatment, with a maximum height of approximately one metre, thus maintaining a relatively low profile. As such, the proposal appears unobtrusive within the street scene, preserving the existing open views along the highway and spacious character of the public realm. Moreover, its limited height appears commensurate with the surrounding boundary treatments. The use of red brick walls and black metal gates reflects those materials observed within the neighbouring built environment, further facilitating the proposal's assimilation with the character of the area and this section of the ASRC.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would be acceptable with regards to its effect on the character and appearance of the area, complying with the relevant provisions of Policies 37 and 44 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019), which when read together require development to complement the scale, proportion, form, layout, and materials of the area, and respect the qualities of Areas of Special Residential Character.

Conditions

9. With the development having already been commenced, the standard time limit condition would be unnecessary. However, a condition to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans would be necessary to provide certainty. Specifications of external materials are included within the submitted plans and therefore a separate materials condition is not required.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would accord with the development plan when read as a whole and there is nothing sufficiently compelling to lead me to find otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR