



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2021

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 DECEMBER 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3279315

34 Priory Avenue, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1JF

- 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 Kingswood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref: DC/21/01973/FULL6 dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension with elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension with elevational alterations at 34 Priory Avenue, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1JF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: DC/21/01973/FULL6 dated 19 April 2021, 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: 4408-21-PL001 P3 and 4408-21-PL002 P3.
 - 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.
 - 4) Notwithstanding Condition 2, prior to first occupation of the extension hereby permitted, the proposed window in the side elevation at first floor level shall be fitted with obscured glazing and be non-openable and, once installed, shall thereafter be retained.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and the local area within an Area of Special Residential Character.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached property on the eastern side of Priory Avenue, within a predominantly residential area. The appeal property lies within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

4. There is a greater variety of house styles at either end of the road, but the majority of the road, including the appeal property, is characterised by semi-detached pairs of properties of varying design. I agree with the Council that there is an open and suburban feel to the ASRC with generally open front gardens and low boundary walls with the buildings following a similar building line. However, I found on my site visit that there is considerable variety in the spacing between the buildings. Moreover, although the semi-detached pairs are distinctive because of the variety of their designs, the lack of symmetry in many of the pairs, as a result of later additions, is also noticeable and a feature in the street scene.
5. The proposal would introduce a two storey side extension with elevational alterations. Although the ground floor extension would project forward under a pitched roof, the first floor extension would be set back from the main front elevation. The extension in terms of its proposed dimensions would be of modest scale and subordinate in scale to the massing of the main house.
6. It would be built with approximately a 1m gap to the side boundary. Although the Council has indicated that it would look to a higher degree of separation in the setting in the ASRC, there is already a range of gaps between properties, with some being close to or on the side boundary whilst others have larger gaps. Given the proposed gap and the design of the extension, as well as the arrangement with the adjoining property, I do not consider that the property as extended would be discordant with the general pattern of development in the local area. It would not appear cramped and it would respect the varied pattern of spacing between buildings.
7. The existing pair of semi-detached properties are not symmetrical as a result of existing additions and alterations, including a forward projecting single storey extension to No 32 under a pitched roof. I do not therefore agree with the Council that there is a visual balance as existing. Moreover, and as already indicated, there is a noticeable lack of symmetry between pairs of semi-detached properties, and as a result I consider that the proposal in relation to its other 'half' would respect the general and varied pattern of development in the vicinity.
8. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area, an ASRC. There would be no conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan and Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which, amongst other things, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations

9. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a number of permissions granted both by the Council as well as on appeal for extensions to properties in the vicinity. Each proposal must be judged on its individual planning merits, but I see nothing in my decision which conflicts with the decisions that have been referenced, including extracts provided from appeal decisions.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. The Council has proposed a number of conditions in the event of planning permission being granted. I agree that the materials should match the existing

materials to protect the character and appearance of the existing building and the ASRC. A condition should be imposed to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

11. For the avoidance of doubt and although indicated on the plans, I shall also impose a condition requiring the first floor side window to be obscure glazed and non-openable, in order to protect the living conditions of the neighbours, given its proximity to the boundary.
12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR