

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 January 2021 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3261636

Linden Lodge, Upper Drive, Biggin Hill TN16 3RE

- 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 Michael Stacey against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/03054/FULL6, dated 3 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension at Linden Lodge, Upper Drive, Biggin Hill TN16 3RE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/20/03054/FULL6, dated 3 July 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: 2003-05 and 2003-06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a detached, chalet-bungalow style dwelling with a conservatory to the rear and a detached garage to the side. It is located on a corner plot facing Upper Drive, with Swievelands Road to the side. The surrounding area is residential in nature and largely comprised of semi-detached and terraced properties, with the appeal property and its neighbour, Blythwood, being the only detached properties in the immediate area.

5. The proposed development is a two-storey side extension with a single storey rear extension and raised patio. The Council has not raised any concerns with regard to the single storey rear extension, which would replace the existing conservatory, or the patio, and I find no reason to disagree with this. Therefore, my assessment will focus solely on the proposed side extension.
6. The proposed side extension would follow the form of the existing dwelling and would extend both the front and rear existing flat roof dormers. Although this would result in a wider dwelling, and dormers across the width of the front and rear elevations, it would be in keeping with the design and height of the existing dwelling and would not appear as an overly dominant or large addition when compared to the size of the host property. Due to the spacious nature of the appeal site and the corner plot location, the proposal would not appear cramped within its surroundings. Furthermore, the dwellings on Upper Drive and Swievelands Road display a variety of styles and designs. Therefore, although it would be visible from the public realm, the proposed extension would not appear incongruous or out of place in the context of surrounding development.
7. The Council states that due to the prominent corner plot location of the appeal site, a greater separation from the side boundary with Swievelands Road would be required. Although the proposal would limit the space to the side of the dwelling, it would leave the minimum gap of 1 metre as required by Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) (LP). The site is set back from Swievelands Road by a verge with a width of at least 2 metres and therefore the spacious character of this residential area would not be significantly harmed by the proposed side extension.
8. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would not conflict with LP Policies 6, 8 and 37. These policies require the scale, form and materials of new residential extensions to be compatible with development in the surrounding area with a minimum of 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site and to be of a high standard of design and layout.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time period for the commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty and precision. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing dwelling is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

Conclusions and Recommendation

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

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR