
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2025

by A Knight BA PG Dip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3351871

21 Edward Road, Biggin Hill, Kent TN16 3HN

- 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 David Warnham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/02207/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is a timber shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form confirms that the development has started, and I was able to see this during my site visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached bungalow (the bungalow) at the southernmost end of Edward Road, near its junction with Sutherland Avenue. Dwellings on the eastern side of Edward Road, including the bungalow, adhere to a loose but recognisable building line in which each is set back from the highway by a similarly modest distance. This gives a consistency to the street despite a mix of architectural styles therein.
5. Tall fencing encloses 22 Edward Road and 85 Sutherland Avenue, opposite the bungalow. I have no evidence that either enclosure is authorised and, in any event, they are exceptions to prevailing local characteristics; In the main, dwellings on Edward Road have low or no front boundary enclosures. This gives a general sense of openness to the street.
6. The appeal concerns a detached timber shed some 4.9m long, 3.1m wide, and 2.1m tall (the shed). It has a simple but neat appearance and is partially screened from view by tall boundary fencing. However, the fencing is unauthorised and has been erected instead of a 1m high brick wall, as approved in 2023 as part of the planning permission for the bungalow. I have no evidence that the existing fencing will remain in position in future and have determined the appeal on that basis.

7. Without the fence to screen it, the shed would dominate the appearance of the bungalow, eroding the otherwise open character of its frontage. It would appear incongruous in the setting, being the only outbuilding in front of the Edward Road building line, and erode the openness that is characteristic of the street. These harmful effects would be exacerbated by the prominence of the shed on the corner of the junction.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a host of properties on Sutherland Avenue where outbuildings exist between the main dwelling and the road, and cited two particular decisions which they consider to set a precedent. The first of these concerns an allowed appeal at No 96 Sutherland Avenue¹, the second a planning permission issued by the Council at No 64A².
9. There is no doubt that front outbuildings are common along Sutherland Avenue. However, generally speaking, houses there have significantly deeper forecourts than found on Edward Road, meaning that development trends which may be acceptable on the former might be harmful on the latter. I saw in my site visit that forecourt buildings on Sutherland Avenue do not have the same dominant effect on their host dwellings as the shed has on the bungalow.
10. Forecourt size was important in the appeal at No 96, the Inspector finding that sufficient areas of greenery and openness would remain to the front area of that house to make it compatible and in harmony with the surrounding dwellings. That would not be the case at the appeal site, where the frontage is far shallower.
11. It is made explicit in the officer report that other, existing, detached garages at properties forming part of the same street scene as No 64A were material in the decision to allow the forecourt garage there. The appeal site bungalow is not part of that same street scene. It faces out onto, and is appreciably part of, Edward Road, where the layout is different to Sutherland Avenue, and does not include recurring forecourt outbuildings. Overall, I attach minimal weight to the cited examples and decisions in Sutherland Avenue.
12. I recognise that the provision of a garden shed is a common requirement for homeowners and that, in granting planning permission for the bungalow, the Council could have anticipated such a requirement. I have no evidence, however, that the permission for the bungalow did not include other garden storage provision, or that a shed as large as that proposed in the appeal should have been foreseen. Furthermore, I have no evidence that an adequate shed could not be positioned either behind the bungalow or closer to the eastern site boundary, subject to a detailed assessment.
13. The development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, contrary to Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) and Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) where they require scrutiny of the design of development proposals, and that they complement the layout of adjacent buildings and areas, and positively contribute to the existing street scene. In addition, for the reasons given above the development also conflicts with the advice contained in the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023), as reproduced by the appellant in their statement.

¹ APP/G5180/D/21/3282210

² DC/21/02006/FULL6

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

A Knight

INSPECTOR