



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2022 by A Humphries BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3295298

5A St John's Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1HS

- 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 Wynand Kluever against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/04241/FULL6, dated 22 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the render of the outside of the property which is currently brick and partial wood cladding. Insert insulation in the upper north facing part of the house which is currently clad with the wood.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the render of the outside of the property which is currently brick and partial wood cladding. Insert insulation in the upper north facing part of the house which is currently clad with the wood at 5A St John's Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1HS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/21/04241/FULL6, dated 22 August 2021, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site Location Plan and Proposed Elevations (A3/04 revision A).
 - 3) The render of the development hereby permitted shall not be applied until the details of its colour and finish have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and the colour of the render shall be maintained thereafter.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. There is a degree of variation between the description of development on the application form and that utilised by the Council on their decision notice. In this regard, I noted that the appellant had adopted the Council's description of development on their appeal form. Whilst I am satisfied that both descriptions

are seeking to describe the proposed development, the above description of development was taken from the Council's decision notice and appeal form as it is more concise.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host dwelling, which is set back from the street, is positioned at the end of a row of four similarly designed properties with steeply pitched roofs and gable ends fronting the street. These properties comprise brick walls with white painted timber cladding on the upper part of the front gable ends. Beyond these, the architectural style and material of properties on the street is varied, many of which have been rendered with different finishes. The majority of these renders are white or cream in colour and to a lesser extent beige pebble dash. This variation contributes to the prevailing character and appearance of the street scene.
6. It is inevitable that the application of a white silicone render would change the appearance of the host dwelling. However, I am not persuaded by the evidence before me that the change to a block render would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling. This is particularly the case as the application of the render would be to the entirety of the property.
7. I acknowledge that within the street scene there are small groups of similarly designed properties, of which some are rendered. These small clusters are also interjected by dwellings of different design and materials. From the street scene, the host dwelling would be viewed in the context of rendered dwellings and therefore the proposal would neither be a departure from the prevailing character and appearance of the street nor appear unduly visually prominent.
8. Furthermore, the colour of the render can be mitigated through a condition to make sure the render conforms to the established palette of colours on the host dwelling and street scene to reduce its visual prominence.
9. For the reasons above, the development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene. The proposed development would therefore accord with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019). Collectively, these policies seek a high standard of design and materials should respect or complement the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard conditions requiring a time limit for commencement of development and adherence to the approved plans, which are necessary and reasonable, the Council has suggested a condition requiring the use of materials to match the existing building. Given that the proposed development is for the application of a render, which is different to the existing external materials of the host dwelling, I consider this condition to be unreasonable. However, a condition relating to the details of the exact shade of white silicone render and finish is considered necessary and reasonable in the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A Humphries

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR