



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2017

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3256335

38 Pickhurst Park, Bromley BR2 0UF

- 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 Ms Sally Anne Tyler against the decision of The London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/01050/FULL6, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a part 1/2 storey rear extension, replacement of roof to include habitable space which includes a side and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part 1/2 storey rear extension, replacement of roof to include habitable space which includes a side and rear dormer window at 38 Pickhurst Park, Bromley BR2 0UF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/20/01050/FULL6, dated 13 March 2020, 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: A1/19098/P/1 Issue No 2 and A1/19098/P/2 Issue No 2.
 - 3) Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a good sized two storey detached house with a generous front garden with driveway and larger garden to the rear. It is located in an area of similar properties, many of which appear to have been the subject of significant extension. The appeal dwelling has itself been the

subject of a flat roofed two storey side extension that has a mansard style roof slope applied to its front.

4. Many of the properties in the area have been extended quite substantially at roof level, some more successfully than others, in terms of their integration into the character and appearance of their host properties and the street scene of the local area. Many of the locally evident roof extensions have resulted in the roof ridge of host properties being extended sideways, resulting in a roof profile that matches that of the larger original houses in the area. There are also many side and rear dormers evident in nearby properties that make up the immediate setting of the appeal property. The result is a streetscene with a variety of roof forms, some quite eccentric.
5. The proposal would extend the existing hipped roof form of the appeal dwelling, creating new roof space above the existing side extension, thereby extending the roof ridge to that side and adjusting the angles of the roof. The proposal would also add a part one and two storey extension to the rear of the property with a hipped and flat roof form. This would be below the ridge height of the main roof of the dwelling. The proposal would also add a large rear dormer extension to the extended rear slope of the main roof of the appeal dwelling and a smaller side dormer to the roof slope opposite the existing side extension. The finishes of the property would be partly altered from the existing predominantly brick finish, with the second floor of the existing house given a new render finish, along with a rendered rear façade above a brick plinth.
6. Although the proposal would result in a sizeable extension, perhaps as large or larger than the largest extensions evident on other similar houses in the area, the proposal would be well integrated into the appeal dwelling, especially in terms of the absorption of the existing side extension into the design of the main house. The proposal would, undoubtedly, result in the appeal dwelling appearing to be a house of greater size, however, it would also maintain the balance and stature of the original house, and would not, therefore, result in these additions and alterations appearing as bulky or incongruous in relation to the house as existing.
7. Although the proposed single storey element of the proposed rear extension would not maintain a 1m side space from the appeal dwelling to the boundary of the neighbouring property at 36 Pickhurst Park (No 36), this follows the line of the existing two storey side extension that does not allow for a side space. The addition of the roof space above the existing side extension would replace the existing flat roof, and rather than creating a cramped form of development in close proximity to No 36, this would result in a better integration of this existing extension into the appeal dwelling. This would lessen its current visual impact as a rather stark addition to the original house and in relation to its neighbour at No 36, which sits at a lower level than the appeal property.
8. In wider views of the appeal property, from both the public and private domains, the proposal would result in the appeal property appearing as a single large house of balanced design. Although the proposal would result in the appeal dwelling appearing larger than existing, it would reflect the scale of other properties in the area and would not appear as an otherwise good house but with a stark and unbalanced side extension. In the context of a

mixture of houses that have not undergone extension or significant alteration at roof level and those that have been extended to a greater or lesser extent, the proposed wider and greater roof form would, therefore, not result in the appeal property appearing to be out of character with the streetscene of the area.

9. I conclude that the proposal would be in accordance with the design aims of Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), which seek to ensure that development proposals are well designed and detailed in relation to the property to be extended and are compatible with development in the local area.

Other Matters

10. Concerns have been raised in relation to the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the residential occupiers of the neighbouring property at 40 Pickhurst Park (No 40) in relation to loss of outlook loss and loss of light to the single storey extension at the rear of this property. I find however that due to the higher ground level on this side of the appeal property, the distances involved and the orientation of properties on this side of the street, any loss of outlook and light resulting from the proposed two storey rear extension would be slight. The proposal would not, therefore, result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 40 to the extent justifying refusal of a planning permission that would result in a better balanced appearance to the appeal property and significantly enhancement of the living conditions of its occupiers. I therefore find that the proposal complies with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) in this regard, as they also seek to ensure that development is compatible with development in the surrounding area and of good design that respects the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings, allowing for outlook and adequate daylight.

Conditions

11. To provide certainty I have added a condition to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. To safeguard the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, I have imposed conditions relating to external building materials.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and with regard to all other issues raised, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR