



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2022

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3303618

10 Cherrycot Rise, Orpington BR6 7DL

- 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 Michael Francis against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/03748/FULL6, dated 23 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a detached external garage building to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached external garage building to the front of the property at 10 Cherrycot Rise, Orpington BR6 7DL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/21/03748/FULL6, dated 23 July 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: 1:1250 Site Location Plan (Produced 14 February 2021) and drawing no PCL/21487/002 Rev B (Proposed plan view and elevations).
 - (3) Before any development takes place above ground level, precise details of the facing materials, window frames, garage door and sedum mat planted roof shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Once approved in writing, the development shall thereafter only be completed and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matter

2. The original description of the proposal on the planning application form is extensive. In the interests of brevity, I have used the more concise description on the Council's decision for the purposes of my decision. However, I have taken the information in the original description into account as part of my assessment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Cherrycot Rise is a private cul-de-sac characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings in a mix of scale, architectural styles and materials. The dwellings are located at a higher level to the street and are set back from front boundaries.
5. The bungalow at No 10 Cherrycot Rise is the last but one property situated towards the far end of the cul-de-sac. There are no properties facing the site and it is screened from the A21 by an intervening band of mature vegetation. No 10 has a hard paved forecourt sloping down to a high brick wall with infill railings to the boundary with the street. The neighbouring bungalows to either side are situated at a similar level to the appeal dwelling and one of these, No 9 Cherrycot Rise, has a detached flat roofed garage fronting the highway.
6. Due to the levels on the appeal site, the host dwelling would sit substantively above the roof level of the garage, thereby retaining a suitable presence in the street scene. This also means that the sedum mat planted roof would help to soften the foreground of the dwelling. The white cement render and anthracite coloured sliding door would give the garage a simple, contemporary aesthetic. The sloping land within the site and boundary treatments to either side would help to conceal views of the building's side elevations. Together, with the position of the garage towards the far end of the cul-de-sac, close to a neighbouring garage of comparable position and height, these factors would help to assimilate the garage into the street scene. As a result, the proposal would be compatible with its immediate surroundings in this particular instance.
7. I conclude, the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard it would comply with the design and character requirements of Policies 6 (Residential Extensions) and 37 (General Design of Development) of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019).

Conditions

8. I have attached the standard timescale for implementation and an approved drawings condition in the interests of certainty. The approved drawings do not specify precise details of the facing materials, window frames, garage door or sedum mat planted roof. I have therefore included a condition requiring these details to be first submitted for approval and for the garage to be completed and maintained in accordance with those details thereafter. This is necessary to ensure the finished scheme is of the design quality envisaged in the supporting information to this appeal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out, the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR