
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3227517
80 Lennard Road, Beckenham SE20 7LY

- 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 John Hadjimina against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/00600/FULL6 dated 4 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is ground floor side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a ground floor side/rear extension at 80 Lennard Road, Beckenham SE20 7LY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: DC/19/00600/FULL6, dated 4 February 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P/02 Proposed ground floor extension existing floor layouts existing elevations & P/01r Proposed ground floor extension proposed floor layouts proposed elevations.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

Procedural Matter

2. Notwithstanding the above description, I note the proposal also includes the demolition of the existing conservatory, rear lean to, shed and concrete/brick bunker and I have determined the appeal on this basis. Works appeared to have commenced at the site with the above elements having been demolished.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large and imposing brick built semi-detached dwelling which benefits from a large rear garden. There is a detached double garage to the side which would be retained.

5. Whilst the extension would be slightly wider than the host property, wrapping around its rear elevation, its footprint would not be excessive in relation to the size of the house and its garden.
6. The extension would incorporate both a pitched and flat roof. The incorporation of the section of pitched roof as proposed would allow the roof pitch to largely reflect that on the host property. The extension would be of a single storey, located predominantly at the rear of the dwelling and would be mostly hidden from public view. Furthermore, there would be no physical effects on the dwelling's existing first-floor fenestration.
7. The white render proposed to finish the extension would offer a contrast with the brickwork on the existing dwelling. However, this would not detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and I consider that the lighter painted finish currently applied to the window heads and cills serves to show that a white finish set against the brickwork would be visually successful. Light coloured render is also a common finish in the immediate area. The roofing material would be similar to that on the host dwelling.
8. Taking all of this into account, the proposed extension would be of acceptable scale, design and materials. Therefore, it would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy 6 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) (LP) which, amongst other things requires that the scale, form and construction materials of residential extensions respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area. It would also comply with Policy 37 of the LP which seeks a high standard of overall design.

Conditions

9. As well as the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition in the interests of certainty concerning the approved plans.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR