



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3258927

1 Tresco Close, Bromley BR1 4LD

- 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 C Robertson against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/02407/FULL6, dated 30 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey rear extension at 1 Tresco Close, Bromley BR1 4LD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/20/02407/FULL6, dated 30 June 2020, 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 strict accordance with the following approved plans: Unnumbered block plan, 260620/1, 260620/2, 260620/3, 260620/4 and 260620/5.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of occupiers of 31 Hillbrow Road, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a three-storey house which is positioned mid-terrace within a short residential terrace of similar properties. The terrace is arranged in a stepped and staggered formation, with Number 33 Hillbrow Road set the furthest forward and properties either side of this being set back from each other. The stepped arrangement is not uniform with some properties set further back from neighbouring properties than others. Some properties have

also been extended to the rear, including the adjacent property at Number 31 Hillbrow Road (No 31). The terrace also steps down from Tresco Road towards Hill Brow Road to accommodate the sloping nature of the road.

4. The proposed two-storey extension would be full-width with a flat roof and would extend rearwards into the garden by approximately 2.6 metres. The modest depth of the extension in combination with its overall height being significantly below the eaves of the host property, would make it appear as a subordinate and sympathetic addition to the property.
5. The rear elevation of the proposed extension would align with the rear elevation of the adjacent property at Number 2 Tresco Close but would project further rearwards of the extension to No 31. This would maintain the existing stepped pattern of the terrace. The properties to the south are at a lower level, however, it would be set down from the eaves of both the host property and those which directly adjoin it. In this context, it would not appear unduly large or dominant. Moreover, with a flat roof it would not be dissimilar to the extension at No 31 although it would be taller and without a balcony.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore accord with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (BLP) which together require a high standard of design that complements the scale and proportions of the host property and adjacent buildings

Living conditions

7. The proposed extension would be on the northern boundary of No 31. It would extend rearwards beyond the existing ground floor extension and first floor balcony to this property. Due to the staggered arrangement of properties, the combined length of the flank wall adjacent to No 31 at first floor level would be around 5 metres, half of which forms the wall of the balcony to this property.
8. The balcony to No 31 is served by large fully glazed doors. The extended flank wall would reduce some outlook from these glazed doors to the north and towards the rear gardens of properties on Tresco Close. However, due to their large glazed areas they would still retain significant views out of these windows to the rear and south. For this reason, I do not find the loss of outlook would be so significant as to materially harm the living conditions of these occupants.
9. At ground floor level, the extension would have a similar relationship to the one that existed between the appeal property and No 31 before this was extended. Furthermore, the boundary fence between these properties restricts outlook from the ground floor windows of No 31 and the proposed development would not significantly increase this.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of No 31, with particular regard to outlook. It would therefore accord with Policy 37 of the BLP which requires development to respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary as this

provides certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, I have imposed a condition requiring materials to match existing.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR