p

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2021

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3266424
124 Queensway, West Wickham, BR4 9DY

- 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 Lana Seaton against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
- The application Ref DC/20/03895/FULL6, dated 25 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2020.
- The development proposed is the construction of a two storey gable roofed side extension, the construction of a single storey rear extension, the construction of a rear dormer window, and the conversion of the attic void into habitable rooms.

Procedural matters

1. I saw at my site visit that works have been undertaken at the property that largely relate to the proposals the subject of this appeal, but not entirely: it appeared to me that those differences include the size and design of the dormer window and the design of the rear extension[1]. My assessment and decision is only on the works as shown in the drawings refused permission by the Council, since the application made to the Council refer to the works as proposed, not having been undertaken, and I have not been provided with any drawings or information relating to any works undertaken on site. My decision therefore has no direct bearing on all the works that might currently exist on the appeal site.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a two storey gable roofed side extension, the construction of a single storey rear extension, the construction of a rear dormer window, and the conversion of the attic void into habitable rooms at 124 Queensway, West Wickham, BR4 9DY in accordance with the terms of the application DC/20/03895/FULL6, dated 25 September 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

[1] This is not an exhaustive list of differences; there may or may not be others. I was only made aware of differences at the site visit and, for the reasons expressed, it is not necessary in this decision for me to detail all changes.

3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans P010, P020 and P001A.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. There are a number of recent planning permissions at the property which I am informed together allowed for, in summary, a two storey side extension with a hipped roof, and a two storey and single storey rear extension. There has also been a Certificate of Lawfulness confirming the change of the original roof of the property without a side extension to a full gable end with a rear dormer. The appeal proposals show a two storey side extension but with a half-hipped gable to that extension, and with a rear dormer to the roof and a rear projection at ground and first floor.

5. I saw at my site visit that the design and form of housing varies in the area. This includes in terms of the original design of houses and also a wide range of extensions and alterations to houses including, most notably for this appeal, changes to the side and roofs of houses. The adjoining houses to the appeal property have been extended to the side, with the result that roof form has altered. The opposite side of Queensway sees houses that have been extended to the side and at roof level, including a side extension with half-hipped roof at No. 129 that the appellant has drawn my attention to was permitted by the Council; that form of extension has strong similarities to the appeal scheme at No. 124.

6. Despite there being a large number of alterations and extensions to houses in the vicinity, the area retains its attractive character of good inter-War suburban housing, with pitched roofs bay windows and gables and traditional domestic architecture. The works to No. 124 would still fit within that character, with the width of the side extension and its half-hipped gable side extension, and the rearward projections to the house, not appearing excessive or out of character with the street.

7. On the main issue it is therefore my conclusion that, having regard to the setting in which the appeal site lies, the proposed development would not conflict with the objectives of Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 which, amongst other matters, aim to ensure new development including extensions respects the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area, and provide adequate space around buildings.

8. The siting, scale and design of the proposed extension would be distant enough from adjoining residents to ensure no harm to amenity by virtue of overlooking, overbearing or loss of light. The absence of any objection on this matter from the local planning authority or from neighbouring residents supports this observation. Adequate parking would be provided for the extended house that satisfies the standards of the Highway Authority.

9. The appeal is therefore allowed. I have attached a condition requiring matching materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development. A condition specifying the approved plans is attached in the interest of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR