



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2019

by Mr Kim Bennett DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3229809

24 Blenheim Road, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2HA

- 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 & Mrs Remzi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/00432/FULL6, dated 25 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey side extension. Single/ part two storey rear extension. Single storey side extension and roof alterations to form habitable accommodation in loft space with rear dormers and rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey side extension. Single/ part two storey rear extension. Single storey side extension and roof alterations to form habitable accommodation in loft space with rear dormers and rooflights at 24 Blenheim Road, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/00432/FULL6, dated 25 January 2019, 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: 3281-19-PL002/Rev P3 and 3281-19-PL001/Rev P4
 - 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.
 - 4) The first floor windows in both side elevations shall be obscure glazed as shown on drawing no 3281-19-PL001/Rev 4 before the development hereby permitted is first occupied and shall thereafter be maintained in that form.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached two storey house on a large plot on the northern side of Blenheim Road. It has a garage on each side, with the western one being set back to the rear of the property, and a long shed which adjoins the rear common boundary with No 22 Blenheim Road. The character of the area is mixed. There are mainly large detached and semi-detached houses but with differing architectural styles and in the main, sited in close proximity. However, on the western side of the site is a bungalow, No 26 Blenheim Road, and there are further bungalows beyond that.
4. Dealing with design issues first, the proposed development would substantially change the appearance of the property. At the front, it would be wider than the existing, slightly higher in height and would introduce new front gable features, including a two storey gable. The Council acknowledges those changes but considers that because of the bulk and massing of the properties to the east, it would be acceptable. I agree with that assessment, noting that it would also be consistent with the scale and massing of properties opposite. Whilst it would be significantly larger than the adjacent property, No 26 Blenheim Road, it would be no closer to it and there would continue to be a good separation between the two.
5. At the rear, the Council considers that the proposed extension would fail to respect the scale and form of the host dwelling. However, although I agree that the extension would not be subservient and would be large in size, it would be well designed, providing a symmetry between the various architectural elements, and would match the style and features of the front elevation. Given the findings of both the Council and myself regarding the alterations to the front, I see no particular harm arising from similar significant alterations to the rear from a purely design point of view. In that respect, I note that there is no particular policy requirement for an extension to be necessarily subservient and given the size of the appeal plot, I do not consider it is strictly necessary in this instance. In reaching that finding, I note that there have been other significant sized extensions at the rear of other properties in close proximity and therefore the proposed rear extension in this case would not be out of character.
6. Turning to living conditions, I deal first with the potential impact upon the occupiers of No 22. That property sits on slightly elevated ground above the appeal site and has a single storey rear extension adjacent to the appeal property, with a further conservatory extension inset from that. The proposed extension would be closer to the common boundary on that side, but the impact of the two storey extension would be mitigated by the large rear gable being inset from the eastern boundary and lower ground level. Although a single storey extension would extend further along that side, it would not be as much as the existing shed which is right on the boundary and has a mono pitched roof with the highest part adjoining the boundary itself.

7. At my site visit, I took the opportunity to inspect the relationship from within the rear garden of No 22. I noted that the fenestration in the rear of the existing adjoining extension is obscure glazed and that the main aspect from the rear conservatory and other rear facing windows is down what is a considerable open and large rear garden.
8. Taking all of the above into account, I find that whilst the bulk of the extension would be apparent, its impact would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of that property in terms of any loss of outlook. I note that the Council acknowledges there would be no loss of sunlight or daylight which I agree with.
9. With regard to potential impact upon No 26, the two properties are separated by a driveway width on either side, and as noted above the two storey extension would not come any closer than the current property does. Although it would extend to a greater depth, and as with the opposite side, would also be apparent, given the spacing between the two properties, I do not consider there would be any loss of outlook. In that respect, I note that the three facing windows in No 26 are a bedroom, a dressing room window to that bedroom and a bathroom. As with No 22, I also note that the Council acknowledges there would be no loss of sunlight or daylight to No 26, which I agree with.
10. Although the proposed replacement garage would be further forward than it presently is, its impact would be similar in terms of it being single storey with a flat roof. I also note that the Council raises no objections to that element of the proposal.
11. Conditions for the development to be built in accordance with the approved plans and for matching materials, are necessary in the interests of certainty and visual amenity. A condition for the first floor side windows to be obscure glazed is necessary in order to protect the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining residential properties.
12. Having regard to the above, the proposed development would be in compliance with Policies 6 and 37 of the Council's Local Plan 2019 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, in that it would respect the host dwelling and be compatible with surrounding development in terms of scale, form and materials, would be of a high standard of design and would respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring properties.
13. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed and planning permission granted.

Kim Bennett

INSPECTOR