



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2019

by R Lankshear BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3232473

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/19/01679/FULL6, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garages and the construction of a two storey front/side and part single/part two storey rear extension, single storey side extension and single storey front extension and roof alterations to include an increase in the height of the roof, rear dormers and rooflights to form habitable accommodation in the roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garages and the construction of a two storey front/side and part single/part two storey rear extension, single storey side extension and single storey front extension and roof alterations to include an increase in the height of the roof, rear dormers and rooflights to form habitable accommodation in the roof space at 24 Blenheim Road, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/01679/FULL6, dated 9 April 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-PL001 Rev P5 and 3281-19-PL002 Rev P4.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.
 - 4) Prior to the use of the development hereby approved the first floor windows in the side elevations shall be obscure glazed as specified on drawing 3281-19-PL001 Rev P5 and maintained as such thereafter.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and ii) living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties in respect of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a large detached dwelling situated within an established residential area. Whilst the dwellings are generally traditional in style and situated in generous plots, there is no overarching architectural form with a mix of bungalows and two storey development; detached and semi-detached properties and variety in materials including hanging tiles, render and brick finishes. The dwelling currently benefits from single storey garages to either side and an outbuilding situated on the boundary with 22 Blenheim Road.
4. The proposed alterations would significantly alter the design of the property to the front, although the Council consider on balance that this in isolation would be acceptable. Having considered the varied character of the street scene and the distance of the development from the site boundaries, I consider that the works when viewed from Blenheim Road would generally respect the character and appearance of the wider street scene.
5. The Council's primary concern relates to the proposed works to the rear. They contend that cumulatively with the mass and bulk of other elements of the proposal, such development would lack subservience failing to respect the general scale and form of the host dwelling and surrounding development. The works to the rear would largely be obscured from the public domain by the dwelling itself and the existing pattern of development. In the context of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area, I consider that the mass, bulk and design of the extensions would respect the character of the host dwelling and would not result in excessive development within the plot, particularly as the property benefits from a generously proportioned garden. It is evident that other properties within the host row have had substantial extensions added to the rear previously. As such, whilst introducing two storey mass projecting further than No 22, I consider that the appeal development would not look materially out of place within the immediate locality.
6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property or to the area. Therefore, it would accord with policies 6 and 37 of the adopted Bromley Local Plan 2019 (BLP) and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, that require development to respect the scale and form of properties and to complement the surrounding area.

Living conditions

7. The proposal would introduce an additional two storey mass to the side and rear of No 22. The neighbouring property sits in an elevated position relative to the appeal site, with no side facing windows within its flank elevation and a single storey rear projection adjacent to the boundary. The nearest rear facing window at ground floor within the single storey projection is obscure glazed, whilst there is also a first floor clear glazed window within the principal dwellinghouse in close proximity to the boundary.
8. The single storey element of the appeal proposal would be situated adjacent to the boundary replacing existing single storey outbuildings and would be set off the boundary with No 22 by approximately 1 metre. Noting its design and

comparable mass to the existing outbuildings, this element would not be unacceptably intrusive when viewed from the neighbouring dwelling.

9. The proposed two storey extensions to the side and rear would maintain an acceptable separation distance from No 22, be situated at a lower level, and have a hipped roof design. Whilst the appeal development would be visible from the neighbouring property to the east, including from rear facing openings, given the design of the proposal, its separation from the neighbouring property, and the difference in levels, I do not consider that the resultant development would be excessive or intrusive. As such, I consider that the appeal development would not result in unacceptable levels of harm to the outlook enjoyed by occupiers of No 22.
10. There are side facing windows within the eastern elevation of No 26 fronting onto the appeal site, and the appeal development would extend the depth of two storey mass to the rear and result in an increase in height of the existing roof. However, the proposal would maintain a significant degree of separation between the appeal development and these windows. This coupled with the limited additional two storey projection and hipped roof design of the appeal development, would mean that there would not be a significant loss of outlook when the development is viewed from these openings. Similarly, and noting the modest height of the single storey garage and rear extension, this development would not result in significant loss of outlook enjoyed by occupiers of No 26.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook for the occupiers of either Nos 22 or 26 Blenheim Road. As such the proposal would accord with policy 37 of the BLP that seeks, amongst other things, to respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Conditions

12. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.
13. In the interests of character and appearance of the area, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring materials to match those of the existing dwelling. In the interests of the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 22 and 26 Blenheim Road, namely privacy, it is necessary to impose a planning condition which requires the windows proposed within the flank elevations of the appeal development to be obscure glazed, as shown on the submitted plans.

Conclusion

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

Robert Lankshear

INSPECTOR