



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3180526

Meribelle, Bickley Park Road, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2AY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land without complying with conditions subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Ellisdon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01087/RECON, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2017.
 - The application sought planning permission for an increase in roof height to include rear dormer to provide habitable accommodation in roof space, first floor side extension and elevational alterations without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref DC/15/00476/FULL6, dated 6 May 2015.
 - The condition in dispute is No 3 which states that: *The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the local planning authority.*
 - The reason given for the conditions is: *In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an increase in roof height to include rear dormer to provide habitable accommodation in roof space, first floor side extension and elevational alterations at Meribelle, Bickley Park Road, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2AY in accordance with the application Ref DC/17/01087/RECON made on the 7 March 2017 without complying with condition No 3 previously imposed on planning permission Ref DC/15/00476/FULL6 dated 6 May 2015, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from 6 May 2015.
 - 2) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: GAH/450/101 Revision B.

Procedural Matter

2. I have noted that the local planning authority has refused permission for reasons relating to an increase in ridge height and change to the pitch of the roof. However, from the plans and the evidence before me it is evident that there is no proposed increase to the overall roof height of the property above that previously approved by the local planning authority under reference DC/15/00476/FULL6, dated 6 May 2015 which this current application seeks to vary.
3. Therefore, I have determined the current appeal on the basis of the proposal shown on Drawing GAH/450/101 Revision B which shows the straightening out of the roof slope between the existing garage eaves and the ridge of the new ridge of the property which has already been approved.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a substantial two storey detached dwelling situated in a mainly residential part of Bickley. It is my understanding that the site is situated within the Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) for Bickley which comprises spacious inter-war residential development with large houses in substantial plots.
6. At my site visit I observed that properties in the locality have different roof designs and heights and I am aware that permission has been granted for several two storey extensions.
7. Policies BE1 and H8 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 (the UDP) require a high standard of design and extensions should be compatible with their surroundings. In ASRCs new development should respect and complement the established qualities of the area according to Policy H10 of the UDP.
8. The proposed amendment to the roof slope would only marginally increase the bulk of the roof and would be entirely compatible with the existing property and the surroundings. The change in the angle of the roof slope would also be appropriate to the host property and its setting. The other alterations including the alteration to the roof of the single storey extension are also acceptable.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such it would accord with the objectives of policies BE1, H8 and H10 of the UDP.

Conclusion

10. Therefore, for the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be allowed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR