
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by Robert Naylor BSc (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3290976

46 Ringshall Road, Orpington BR5 2LZ

- 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 Urim Cahani against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/04758/FULL6, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and demolition of existing rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and demolition of existing rear conservatory at 46 Ringshall Road, Orpington BR5 2LZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04758/FULL6, dated 27 September 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: PB-21/46RING/01; PB-21/46RING/02; PB-21/46RING/03; PB-21/46RING/04 and PB-21/46RING/10.
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour, style, bonding and texture those of the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building occupies a prominent corner plot in a residential area where two storey dwellings predominate as a mix between semi-detached and terraced examples. There is a suburban feel to the area where building address their street frontage, following the curvature of the road. Whilst I note the minimum gap standards advanced by Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (BLP), local plots are mixed and irregular in shape which creates gaps between buildings of varying degrees.
4. Whilst the gap between the extended dwelling and No. 44 Ringshall Road would fall below the required standard, being approximately 0.75m at its closest, this would be set within a noticeably varied context. Specifically, and in the case of

corner plots like the appeal site, they tend to be more spacious due to their irregular shaped. In addition, there are other instances in the surrounding area where adjoining properties are closer following two-storey extensions.

5. No. 101's extension is set back from the main façade appearing subservient to the host property, unlike the appeal proposal. Conversely however, No. 44 Ringshall Road and No 65 Silverdale Road are similar properties to the appeal building which both have two-storey side extensions that sit flush with the host property, in complimentary scale, design and material thereto.
6. The location of the appeal building allows unrestricted views of it from various directions. However, the positioning itself does not make the proposal unacceptable and it would not be unacceptably prominent because of its respectful scale, form and materials. The street scene would be altered. The resulting juxtaposition of the extended dwelling would have a sufficient gap, resembling the other more tightly arranged parts of the surrounding area and would thus not appear cramped. As such, any minor infringements in respect to the resulting gap at the rear would not weigh heavily against approval of the scheme, in terms of unacceptably lowering established spatial standards of the surrounding area.
7. The proposal would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it would accord with principles of Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the BLP 2019 which amongst others, requires all new development to achieve high quality design respecting the host dwelling and being compatible with development in the surrounding area.

Conditions

8. I have imposed conditions requiring commencement of development within three years and development in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. I have also attached a condition requiring the use of matching materials in the interests of a good quality appearance to the development.

Conclusion

9. The proposed developments would meet the requirements of the development plan, the appeal should therefore succeed.

Robert Naylor

INSPECTOR