
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2016

by G J Fort BA PGDip LLM MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3155517

114 Grove Park Road, Mottingham, Kent SE9 4QB

- 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 Seale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/02146/FULL6, dated 29 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a part one/two storey side extension and first floor rear extension incorporating annexe accommodation and solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part one/part two storey side extension and first floor rear extension incorporating annexe accommodation and solar panels at 114 Grove Park Road, Mottingham, Kent SE9 4QB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/16/02146/FULL6, dated 29 April 2016, subject to the conditions in the schedule to this decision below.

Procedural matters

2. I have used the description of development from the decision notice in the banner heading above as it captures more accurately and succinctly the scope of the appeal scheme. I note that the description of development on the appeal form broadly follows the form of words I have used above.
3. Different spellings of the appellant's name were given on the application and appeal forms. An e-mail to the Planning Inspectorate dated 3 August 2016 confirmed that the spelling I have used in the banner heading above is the correct one.

Main Issues

4. I consider the main issues in this appeal to be the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of its host dwelling and the wider surroundings.

Reasons

5. Situated at the end of a short terrace, the appeal dwelling is set back from Grove Park Road, a busy distributor route. The appeal dwelling is faced in brick and has a gable-ended roof, the end of which forms the front elevation of the
-

property. The ridge line of the appeal dwelling's roof runs perpendicularly to the rest of the terrace, with the exception of the dwelling at its other end, which is similarly orientated. The front elevations of both of these end dwellings project forward from the principal building line of the terrace. Although the immediate surroundings of the appeal site are broadly residential in character I saw a variety of styles and scales of property, including the tall multi-storey flats across the road and to its side a large residential complex.

6. The appeal scheme would supply annexe accommodation and additional living space through the construction of a two-storey side extension, which would be set back from the appeal dwelling's principal building line, on a line with the rest of the terrace. The ridge line of the proposed extension to the front would be stepped down from that of its host dwelling. This two-storey element would project into the appeal dwelling's back garden, with a further single-storey mono-pitched roof element extending beyond that, roughly on a line with the back wall of the existing garage, which would be demolished. A two-storey extension would also be added to the appeal property's rear elevation, which would be stepped down from its ridge line, and in from its boundary, but have the same angle of roof pitch.
7. Although the proposed development would undoubtedly be a substantial extension to the property, its set back from the front building line of its host dwelling, and set down from its ridge mean that it would read as a subservient and not a dominant addition to No 114. The depth of the appeal dwelling's garden, and the adequate separation distances that would be achieved between the proposed development and other buildings mean that the extension would not appear cramped or over-developed.
8. I saw on site that, due to the terrace's length, there are limited viewpoints where its symmetry and balance can be appreciated. Moreover, the host dwelling would still read as the dominant architectural endpoint of the terrace due to the proposed development's set back and step down. Consequently, in these views the proposed development would not interfere, to any significant degree, with the terrace's symmetry or balance. Neither would it, given its sympathetic pattern of fenestration and roof design, interfere unduly with the terrace's architectural rhythm.
9. Consequently, the appeal scheme would read as neither an over-dominant nor a bulky addition. Thus it would cause no material harm to the character of either its host dwelling or that of the wider terrace, or the streetscene more generally. This lack of material harm leads me to the conclusion that the proposed development would not conflict with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan (adopted July 2006); which, taken together, and amongst other matters, seek to ensure that extensions do not detract from the existing streetscene and respect the scale, form and layout of their host buildings and wider surroundings.

Conditions

10. I have considered the list of conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This states that conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects.

11. I have attached the standard implementation condition to comply with the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). In the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition which specifies the approved plan. A condition is attached requiring the use of matching materials in the external facing of the extension to ensure that the proposed development is sensitive to the character and appearance of its host dwelling and the wider terrace.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would not conflict with the development plan insofar as the policies that have been brought to my attention are concerned. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

G J Fort

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: PROPOSED TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO FORM DEPENDANT'S ANNEXE AND PART REAR FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION (Drawing no. 15.359 Revision B).
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.