

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2019

**by S Leonard BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 05 November 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3234090**  
**156 Pickhurst Rise, West Wickham BR4 0AW**

- 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 Colin Roberts against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
  - The application Ref DC/19/01699/FULL6, dated 8 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2019.
  - The development proposed is hip to gable loft conversion incorporating rear dormer and juliet balcony, single storey part rear extension and internal alterations.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for hip to gable loft conversion incorporating rear dormer and juliet balcony, single storey part rear extension and internal alterations at 156 Pickhurst Rise, West Wickham BR4 0AW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/01699/FULL6, dated 8 April 2019, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos. 8000\_PA\_00, 8000\_PA\_01, 8000\_PA\_02, 8000\_PA\_03, 8000\_PA\_04 and 8000\_PA\_05.
  - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

## Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice, which matches that on the appeal form. It adequately and simply describes the proposed development instead of the much longer and detailed description given on the application form.
3. The only point of difference between the parties relates to the effect of the rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of 158 Pickhurst Rise. I do not disagree with the Council's view on the other elements of the appeal proposal or their stance about the rear extension's effect on the character and appearance of the area.

## **Main Issue**

4. The main issue is the effect of the single storey rear extension upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 158 Pickhurst Rise in terms of outlook and light.

## **Reasons**

5. The appeal property is a two-storey end-of-terrace dwellinghouse, located on the southeast side of Pickhurst Rise, a suburban residential road. The property has pebble-dash and exposed brick finished walls under a tiled hipped roof. There is a single storey flat-roofed extension to the rear which has an L-shaped footprint with the set-back element sited adjacent to No.158. The extension has a maximum depth of about 4.1m and a height of about 3m.
6. The appeal scheme proposes the removal of the rear extension and its replacement with a full width extension, which would project to the same depth as the existing, effectively filling in the gap adjacent to No.158 and 'squaring off' the rear single storey part of the property. The proposed rear extension would have a flat roof of the same height as the existing, incorporating a centrally located roof lantern.
7. No.158 has not been extended to the rear. Its rear wall contains four floor-to-ceiling windows/doors leading out onto a paved patio which extends across the width of the house. The presence of garden furniture suggests that the patio is well-used as an outdoor seating area. The patio is bound by the side wall of the appeal property's existing rear extension, which projects to a depth of about 1.6m, in addition to a timber fence which is about 1.5m in height. Although off-set from the boundary, the remainder of the appeal property's rear extension contributes to the existing sense of enclosure around the rear elevation and patio of No.158. In addition, a raised bed containing mature shrubs in the garden of No.158, which is sited opposite the off-set part of the appeal property, provides substantive screening to this part of the boundary. On the other side, the patio is flanked by the side wall of a rear single storey extension at 160 Pickhurst Rise, which projects to a depth of about 3m and has a pitched roof with gable side facing No.158.
8. The proposed rear extension would extend the depth of single storey built form next to No.158 by about 2.5m. However, having regard to the existing boundary screening and sense of enclosure along this boundary, this would not result in any greater harm to No.158 in terms of enclosure or shading effects than those which already exist, given that the rear elevation and patio of No.158 are already significantly enclosed. Also, the large glazing in the ground floor rear elevation of No.158 means that any resulting additional reduction in light to the ground floor accommodation served by these windows would be minimal in comparison to the light already experienced. Accordingly, although there would be marginal impacts on the outlook and light experienced by the occupants No.158, these impacts would not be so materially harmful as to warrant refusal of the appeal scheme.
9. Having regard to the above, I find that there would be no demonstrable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.158. The appeal proposal would accord with Policy 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019, in so far as it aims to ensure that new development respects the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

### **Conditions**

10. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the national Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary to define the plans, and ensure that the proposed external materials match those of the existing dwelling, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed, and planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

*S Leonard*

INSPECTOR