
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by Caroline Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3167330
3 Alpine Copse, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2AW

- 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 Catherine Harrison-Higham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/04084/FULL6, dated 31 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
 - The development was originally described as "the side elevation has been approved under planning reference 16/02271/FUL/6 with a 500mm set back to the front elevation. On reflection we feel it would look more aesthetically pleasing to bring the extension forward to line through with the main elevation. These properties are unique with the Alpine theme and the set back does not really work in this case."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor side extension at 3 Alpine Copse, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2AW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/16/04084/FULL6, dated 31 August 2016, , subject to the following 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 plans: Location plan, proposed front elevation and proposed rear elevation (pitched roof), proposed side elevation (pitched roof) and proposed first floor side extension Rev B except in respect of the proposed elevations and roof plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I saw at my site visit that a flat roof first floor side extension, flush with the front elevation has already been constructed. I note that the site benefits from permission for a flat roof first floor side extension¹ albeit with a small set back. The application was originally submitted to the Council as a revision to the extant permission. The scheme was amended during the course of the application to incorporate a pitched roof. I have therefore considered the

¹ 16/02271/FULL6

appeal on the basis of the 'proposed development' considered by the Council as shown on the submitted plans rather than what has actually been built.

3. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice in the decision above. I consider this a more precise and succinct description of development than that in the banner heading above which was taken from the application form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. 3 Alpine Copse is a detached house situated in a cul-de-sac of timber clad properties of similar character with two distinct designs, those with a cat slide roof and those with gable roofs. The site is located within the Bickley Area of Special Residential Character.
6. The first floor side extension would be located over the existing garage with a pitched roof set down from the main roof. The extension would be flush with the front elevation. Whilst the extension would result in the loss of the cat slide roof, I am mindful that there is an extant permission for a first floor side extension with a flat roof in the same location. Moreover, the extension would be visually simple with matching materials. It would respect the character and general proportions of the host dwelling. For these reasons, I am satisfied that the 'alpine' character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area would not be eroded as a result of the proposal.
7. I have had regard to neighbours' concerns regarding fire spread. However, no substantive evidence has been supplied to demonstrate that this would be the case. In any event, fire safety within and around buildings is controlled by Building Regulations. I note the representations regarding an air conditioning unit at the site, however, this does not form part of the appeal scheme before me.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area and find no conflict with Policies H8, H10 and BE1 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006) which seek, amongst other things, development that respects or complements the scale, form, layout and materials of the host dwelling and adjacent buildings, respects and complements the established and individual qualities of the individual areas of special residential character and does not detract from the existing street scene.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. I have specified the approved plans in order to provide certainty. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, matching materials are necessary.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Caroline Jones

INSPECTOR