



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/20/3261667

14 Westland Drive, Bromley, BR2 7HF

- 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 John Toomey against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/02317/FULL6, dated 24 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'side extension'.
-

Procedural matters

1. The submitted plans show the proposals involve a first floor side extension and a partial conversion of the existing garage. This was reflected in the Council's description of the proposed development and so I have determined the appeal on this basis, namely a first floor side extension and part garage conversion.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension and part garage conversion at 14 Westland Drive, Bromley, BR2 7HF in accordance with the terms of the application DC/20/02317/FULL6, dated 24 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 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 plan P/01r.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. Policy 8 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 states that, normally, proposals for extensions two or more storeys in height should have a minimum 1m space from the side boundary of the site. The proposed side extension would continue the existing building lines of the garage at the property and so the spacing to the side boundary would be less than this.
-

However, I saw at my site visit that a number of other properties in the vicinity have side extensions that are close to their side boundaries, including No. 16 to which the appeal property is attached, and houses to the east and on the opposite side of the road. I also saw that there is good separation between No. 14 and the house to the west, due to a curve in the road, the different orientation of houses, and the different design of houses to the west.

5. These two matters mean that the proposed side extension to No. 14 would not appear out of character with the varied appearance and form of housing in the area, nor would there be any harmful effect on spaciousness in the area. Hence, the proposals would satisfy the objectives of Policy 8 as set out in the supporting text to that Policy at paragraph 2.1.68 of the Local Plan, namely to prevent a cramped appearance and terracing occurring, and to protect spatial standards and visual amenity.
6. The front elevation of the extended house would be set back from the existing projecting front bay, and so the proposal would not appear unduly intrusive or harmful to the appearance of the building. The resulting roof form would be well-balanced and appropriate to the house.
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 8 and 37 of the Local Plan 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 extension would not project further to the rear than the existing building and, with the siting of houses, be orientated away from the neighbour at No. 12. That house also has a single storey rear and side extension that would adjoin the proposed extension. These matters lead to no harmful effect on neighbouring residents through overbearing effect, loss of privacy or 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 retained for the house with the partially converted garage – I saw at my site visit that space currently exists – with the Highways Authority raising no objection.
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. The Council have also suggested a condition requiring the provision of a parking space, and/or garages, and turning space prior to the commencement of development. However, the response from the Highways Authority was no objection to the proposal as there remained spaces on the appeal site that could be utilised for parking. I have commented above that I saw and concur with this, and hence I consider such a condition not necessary or relevant to the development being permitted.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR