



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2019

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3226042

25 Mosyer Drive, Bromley, London BR5 4PN

- 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 Michael Nash against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/18/05632/FULL6, dated 10 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, first floor side extension over existing garage, loft conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights, part conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation and new front porch with pitched roof over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, first floor side extension over existing garage, loft conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights, part conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation and new front porch with pitched roof over, at 25 Mosyer Drive, Bromley, London BR5 4PN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/18/05632/FULL6, dated 10 December 2018, 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: SJH/18/1480 and SJH/18/1481A.
 - 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 dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development above is taken from the appeal form, as this includes reference to the part conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation, the loft conversion and the rear dormer elements, which were not mentioned on the original application form. It is a more accurate description of the proposed development, and I have determined the appeal on that basis. The Council dealt with the application in the same way, and used the description above in its officer report and decision notice, so I do not consider that any party's interests have been harmed by my proceeding in this way.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene of Mosyer Drive.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house, built of yellow/buff brick with a brown tiled hipped roof, and with an attached garage which extends to the boundary with No 23. With its neighbouring house at No 27, it forms what would appear to have originally been a symmetrical pair, although as No 27 has been extended under a 1971 planning permission much of that symmetry has long been lost. The wider area is residential, mostly comprising semi-detached bungalows and two storey houses, although there are also a number of detached properties. Low boundary walls and reasonably sized front gardens contribute to the area's spacious character. Along Mosyer Drive there is some variety of building styles and finishes, including the use of different coloured bricks, a mixture of hipped and gable ended roofs, and building lines vary along the gently curving street. At the same time, the neat and generally simple lines of the buildings give the street a pleasant and orderly feel.
5. The proposed development would add a first floor side extension above the garage, a porch at the front, and a single storey ground floor extension to the rear which would replace an existing smaller conservatory. It would also extend the existing roof above the first floor extension to continue the ridge line of the host building to a new side hip, adding roof lights to the front pitch and a flat-roofed dormer to the rear. No concerns have been raised about the rear ground floor parts of the proposal, nor about the loft conversion elements.
6. Policy 8 of the January 2019 Bromley Local Plan (the Local Plan) seeks to ensure that a minimum 1 metre space is retained at properties' side boundaries where development of two or more storeys is proposed. In this case, the garages of both No 23 and the appeal property extend to the common boundary, so there is no gap to retain at ground level. At first floor level, the existing gap between the properties allows for glimpses of trees and other buildings to the rear.
7. The first floor of the proposed extension would be set in by 1 metre from the boundary with No 23, which would ensure that there would not be a terracing effect or cramped appearance. As No 23 is a bungalow, a visually-permeable gap – albeit narrower than at present – would be retained. The set back at the side of the appeal property, the pitched roof above the ground floor extension, and the creation of a new hipped flank to the main roof would also reduce the impact of the proposed extension. This would ensure that, although the appeal property is both higher than and set forward of No 23, the proposed extension would not appear over-dominant in its setting or have a harmful effect on the spacious feel of the street.
8. The proposal as a whole, by extending above the garage and continuing the existing roof line to a new hipped flank, would go some way to restoring the symmetry with No 27 while at the same time ensuring that gaps between blocks are retained and potential terracing effects avoided. The design and use of matching materials would ensure that the proposal is congruent with both the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

9. Notwithstanding the breach of the 1 metre gap requirement set out in Policy 8 of the Local Plan, I conclude that on balance the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance both of the host property and the street scene. It would therefore be in accordance with Policies 6 and 37 of the Local Plan which, taken together, seek to ensure that developments are of a high standard of design, compatible with the surrounding area and maintain appropriate space or gaps between buildings.

Other matter

10. The part conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation would result in the loss of one parking space, but the Council is satisfied that the property would still be able to provide 2 off-street car parking spaces.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have also included a condition requiring materials matching the existing dwelling to be used for the extension.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector