



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3241801

36 Homestead Road, Orpington BR6 6HW

- 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 Broadfield against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/19/03541/FULL6, dated 13 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at 36 Homestead Road, Orpington BR6 6HW in accordance with the terms of application Ref DC/19/03541/FULL6, dated 13 August 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Drawing Nos. 2775-18-PL001 Rev P8 and 2775-18-PL002 Rev P7.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Chelsfield Park Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling located on the south side of Homestead Road. The property is slightly set-back from the road within a spacious plot with a landscaped front garden. A paved driveway and garage abut the boundary with No.38.
-

5. The appeal property lies within the Chelsfield Park Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). This is not a designated heritage asset so does not benefit from the same protections as a conservation area under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Nonetheless it is described in the delegated officer report as being characterised by its spacious sylvan, landscaped and semi-rural setting combined with the wide variety in the styles, sizes and designs of houses. On my site visit, I observed a variation in the gaps between properties with some possessing double storey flank elevations built right up to their boundaries.
6. The proposal would result in the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a two-storey hipped roof extension that would be set back from the central front elevation in line with the existing extension to the other side of the dwelling. The ground floor of the proposed extension would incorporate a new garage. It would allow for a small gap between the two-storey element and the common boundary with No.38. The windows would reflect the fenestration design on the existing façade. Overall its design would not be inharmonious with the host dwelling or the street scene.
7. Although the extension would reduce the gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling at No.38, it would still allow for a separation space that, in my view, would not dramatically erode the sense of spaciousness and sylvan character of the area. The resultant gap would still allow for glimpses through the site and, considering the existence of similar separation gaps between properties on Homestead Road and in the wider ASRC, the proposal would not appear incongruous in its context. The wide front garden would be retained thus maintaining the verdant character of the appeal site when seen from the road. Although No.36 lies in an elevated position in the streetscene, the proposed development would not appear unreasonably prominent as the resultant dwelling would be similar in size to other properties in the vicinity.
8. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the Chelsfield Park ASRC and so would comply with policy 44 of the Bromley Local Plan (the 'local plan') which seeks to ensure proposals respect and enhance the special and distinctive qualities of Areas of Special Residential Character. The proposed development would also not conflict with local plan policy 8 which seeks to maintain appropriate separation distances between properties as well as policies 6 and 37 of the local plan and policy 7.4 of the London Plan which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials match the existing building, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

11. I have had regard to the further conditions requested by the Council dealing with wash down facilities and a construction and environmental management plan. However, given the small scale of the development proposed I am not persuaded that such measures are necessary or fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Therefore, I have not imposed them.

Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR