



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3242307

33A Hillview Road, Orpington BR6 0SE

- 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 Richard Beard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/04185/FULL6, dated 27 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2019.
 - The proposed development is roof extension to increase habitable space and 2 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey rear infill extension, incorporating conversion of existing garage and first floor side/rear extension incorporating side/front dormers and Juliet balcony to rear at 33A Hillview Road, Orpington BR6 0SE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/19/04185/FULL6, dated 27 September 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: A1/18055/p/1/r1 and A3/18055/p/2/r1.
 4. The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the window of the south-facing dormer extension at first floor level has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

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.
-

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the proposed development set out within the above banner heading has been taken from the application form. During the course of the application, the Council suggested an amended description of development to which the appellant agreed. The altered description is included in the appeal form and on the decision notice as an agreed amended description and in my view more accurately describes the development. For clarity and precision, the amended description of the proposed development set out within the above decision has therefore been taken from the decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse on the western side of Hillview Road. Properties in the vicinity of the appeal site vary in scale and design with several properties opposite the appeal site featuring large roof and side dormer extensions.
6. The proposed roof extension, which would extend the ridge by around 1.5m, would be set back from the front elevation. As such, it would have an appropriately subservient appearance that would respond positively to the original proportions of the appeal property. Whilst the dwelling would appear larger in views from Hillview Road, the resultant form would be broadly similar to that of properties such as Nos. 30, 34 and 38 and therefore would not have an overtly bulky or incongruous appearance within the immediate context of the streetscene. The modest scale of the front dormer within the front roofslope would also appear as a suitably subordinate addition to the host building.
7. I note the Council's concerns regarding the separation distance from the neighbouring property. The southern elevation of the proposed extension would be set back only 0.45m from the side boundary with No. 33. However, No. 33 is set back from the side boundary by around 2m at first-floor level. Furthermore, as the extended roof form of the proposal would slope away from the side boundary, any loss of spaciousness between the two properties would be minimal. In light of these considerations, the proposal would retain a sufficient sense of openness between No. 33 and the appeal property.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy 6 of the Local Plan (2019), which states that residential extensions should respect the scale, form and materials of the host dwelling and be compatible with the surrounding area, and Policy 37 of the Local Plan, which states that development proposals should be designed to a high standard. The proposal would also comply with the No. 1 General Design Principles Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003), which states that development should respect the character of its locality, and the No. 2 Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Guidance (2003), which states that development should respect the character and appearance of the site, its immediate

neighbours and the wider street scene. While the proposal would not comply with Policy 8 of the Local Plan, which states that a minimum of 1m space from the side boundary of a site should be retained for proposals of two or more storeys, I have nonetheless found that the proposal would retain adequate space between the appeal property and the adjoining dwelling.

Other Matters

9. The proposed south-facing dormer extension would be in close proximity to the side-facing windows of No. 33 to the south. However, as this dormer would serve an ensuite, it is reasonable for the window of this proposed dormer to be obscure-glazed in order to safeguard the living conditions of the occupants of No. 33 in respect of their privacy.

Conditions

10. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the proposal shall be built with materials matching the external surfaces of the existing building in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.
11. Additionally, for the avoidance of doubt, I have imposed a condition requiring that the proposal is built in accordance with the approved plans.
12. In addition to the Council's conditions, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the window of the south-facing dormer extension be obscure-glazed prior to the occupation of any of the extensions. As the dormer extension would be positioned in close proximity to the north-facing windows of No. 33 to the south, this condition is imposed in the interests of preserving the privacy of the occupants of No. 33.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR