



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3270572
45A Silver Lane, West Wickham, BR4 0SG

- 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 Joheina Babiker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/03476/FULL6, dated 1 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 45A Silver Lane, West Wickham, BR4 0SG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/20/03476/FULL6, dated 1 September 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: 1901 10.100; 1901 10.201; 1901 10.202; 1901 10.271; 1901 30.200 R03; 1901 30.201; 1901 30.202; 1901 20.202.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey end of terrace dwelling, located on a corner plot at the junction of Silver Lane and Glebe Way.
4. The Council has granted planning permission¹ for a single storey side extension following the demolition of an existing attached garage. The attached garage has since been largely demolished. The appeal proposal is for a two storey side

¹ LPA ref. 19/02125/FULL6

extension to the dwelling, with the ground floor footprint being the same as that of the consented extension.

5. The proposed two storey extension would have a depth of about 8.6 metres and a width of approximately 3.4m, tapering down to 2.8m wide at the rear. The eaves and ridge height of the extension would be the same as the host property.
6. The design of the proposed extension would reflect that of the existing dwelling. The extension would be set back from the existing two storey bay, allowing this architectural feature to continue to dominate the front elevation. The extension would have a gable end thereby reflecting the design of the existing dwelling. The extension would also be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling. Having regard to all of these factors, in my view the proposed extension would integrate well with the host dwelling and would not appear as an overly bulky addition.
7. The space to the side of the dwelling was previously occupied by a single storey garage with a 1.8m high fence running along the boundary with Glebe Way. The proposed extension would be clearly visible from Glebe Way given its two storey height, however, the proposed extension would be set back from the side boundary fence by 1 metre for its length and would be read against the profile of the existing dwelling. Given the existing boundary enclosure and the relatively modest size and scale of the proposed extension, I do not consider that the proposal would be unduly prominent when viewed from Glebe Way and would not significantly erode the spacious character of the locality. Moreover, the appellant has also highlighted other examples along Glebe Way where two storey flank walls are in close proximity to the side boundary.
8. I therefore find that the proposal would comply with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) which together seek to ensure that development is of a high quality and is compatible with its surroundings and respects or maintains spaces or gaps between buildings.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard 3 year implementation condition, the approved plans condition is imposed for clarity. I have also imposed a condition to requiring materials to match those of the existing dwelling to protect visual amenity.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR