
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2017

by Ian McHugh DIP TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3168530

174 Leasons Hill, Chislehurst, BR7 6QL

- 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 Mr Ryan Van Der Vyver against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/03845/FULL6, dated 15 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a part one/two storey side extension and rooflights at side and rear.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The description of the development provided in the banner heading above is taken from the appeal form and from the Council's decision notice. It differs from the rather lengthy description that was stated on the planning application form. I consider that the proposal is to construct first floor and two storey extensions above and at the rear of the existing garage, with rooflights in the newly created and reconfigured roof areas. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part one/two storey side extension and rooflights at side and rear at 174 Leasons Hill, Chislehurst, BR7 6QL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: DC/16/03845/FULL6, dated 15 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P001 Rev B; P002 Rev B; P003 Rev A; P004 Rev A; P005 Rev B; P006 Rev A; P007 Rev A; P008 Rev A; P009 Rev B; and P010 Rev B.
 - 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.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling, which is set-back from the road and which is situated in a relatively large plot within a residential area. The surrounding area contains substantial detached houses; smaller linked/semi-detached dwellings; and bungalows. In my opinion, there is no predominant character in terms of building size or appearance.
5. The dwelling has previously been extended and the proposal is to construct further extensions, as described in paragraph 1 above. The appellant has submitted a statement detailing that the extensions are required to cater for his family's needs. Policies BE1 and H8 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006 seek to ensure (amongst other things) that development proposals, including residential extensions, should exhibit high quality design; should not detract from the streetscene; and should respect and complement the existing building and the local area. In my opinion, these policies are consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which contains similar requirements (paragraphs 17 and 58).
6. The appeal proposal would add significantly to the bulk and mass of the dwelling and, consequently, it would add to the prominence of the house in the streetscene. However, the extensions are sympathetically designed, in terms of their overall form, external materials and roof shape. Whilst the first floor extension above the existing garage would project in front of the existing front wall of the dwelling, this, together with the variety of roof heights, would help to break up the mass of the building and add interest to its appearance. I acknowledge that the extended property would be larger than its neighbouring dwellings. However, I am not persuaded that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance of the streetscene because of the wide variety of house types along Leeson's Hill, including substantial detached properties to the west.
7. On the basis of the above, I consider that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of either the appeal property or on the streetscene. Accordingly, it would not conflict with the Development Plan or with the Framework, as referred to above.

Other Matters

8. I note that the Council received an objection to the proposal from the occupiers of the adjoining bungalow, Crayhurst, to the west. The Council concluded that there was no harm to the living conditions of the occupants arising from the proposal, due to the separation distances between the buildings; boundary vegetation; and because the height of the extensions/new roofing would be no taller than the existing appeal dwelling. I have no reason to disagree with that conclusion.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. These have been considered in the light of the advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
10. To ensure a satisfactory appearance, a condition requiring the use of external materials to match the existing dwelling is also necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR