



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 NOVEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3291982

5 Spring Gardens, Chelsfield, Bromley BR6 6HJ

- 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 Dan Williams against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/05429/FULL6, dated 11 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as two storey side, single storey rear and porch roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side, single storey rear and porch roof at 5 Spring Gardens, Chelsfield, Bromley BR6 6HJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref DC/21/05429/FULL6, dated 11 November 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have noted that the planning application form contained an incorrect postcode for the appeal site address. The appellant has confirmed that this was a drafting error and has provided the correct postcode on the appeal form. I have used the corrected postcode for this decision.
3. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the construction of the side and rear extensions had commenced. However, the construction works were yet to be completed, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The two storey-semi detached appeal property is located in a residential cul de sac. This part of the street is defined by pairs of semi-detached properties, set back from the highway with front lawns or parking areas, and architectural details such as central chimneys, bay windows and hipped roofs. The palette of external materials employed in the area is consistent.
6. A number of properties on the street have two storey side projections. However, there has not been a uniform design approach to the projections, which take a variety of forms. There are examples of side projections with

hipped roofs, flat roofs and mono-pitched roofs. Given the existing variety of roof forms, I do not find that the proposed "barn end" roof would be an incongruous addition within the streetscene. It would reduce the bulk of the extension, whilst helping the form of the addition to integrate visually with the host dwelling. The extension's roof would be set below the highest point of the existing roof, and its front elevation would have a small set back from the dwelling's principal elevation. In this way it would not be dissimilar, in form and layout, to the extension at No. 33 and would maintain a level of subservience to the host property.

7. The two storey side extension and the roof extension would increase the width and bulk of the property and would be visible in views along Spring Gardens and The Meadway. However, the plans indicate that there would be a reasonable gap maintained between the proposed side wall and the ownership boundary. Whilst there would be some loss of openness, as with all extensions, I conclude that a sufficient visual gap with the neighbouring property would remain. The extensions would alter the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached houses, as any side extension would. However, I do not find that this would be more visually prominent than other examples of two storey side projections within the streetscene. Given the extension's complimentary roof design I conclude that this would not unacceptably unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties.
8. The front porch would not be excessively large and would have a hipped roof which would visually relate to the house's main roof. Likewise, the rear extension, whilst a generous depth, would have a pitched roof, and due to its position to the rear of the property would have no demonstrable impact on the streetscene.
9. The use of a planning condition would ensure that the facing materials used in the extension match the existing materials at the property, thereby ensuring that it would complement the character of the house.
10. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed extensions would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Bromley Local Plan (20219) Policies 6 and 37 which, amongst other aspects, seek to ensure high quality design which does not harm the streetscene or host building.

Conditions

11. The Council has provided a list of conditions, which I have assessed in regard to the advice provided in the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). I have imposed an approved plans condition in the interests of certainty. Similarly, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, the external materials must match those used in the existing building. As the construction has already commenced, I have not imposed a condition requiring the development hereby permitted to begin within three years from the date of the decision.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the development plan and the Framework. The appeal is therefore allowed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PD/21/001/04; PD/00/001; PD/00/002-A.
- 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.