



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2022

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3302692

12 Ravensbury Road, Orpington, Bromley BR5 2NP

- 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 & Mrs Brerro against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/01083/FULL6, dated 9 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side/rear extension including new external staircase to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side/rear extension including new external staircase to rear at 12 Ravensbury Road, Orpington, Bromley BR5 2NP in accordance with the terms of the application, DC/22/01083/FULL6, dated 9 March 2022, 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: 20/2691/PL/SLP Rev A, 20/2691/PL/04 Rev D, 20/2691/PL/06 Rev D, 20/2691/PL/05 Rev B.
 - 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) The first floor window to the en suite in the front elevation of the development hereby permitted shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the description of the development varies between the documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the concise description from the Council's decision notice that has also been used by the appellant in their statement of case.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:

- The character and appearance of the local area, with reference to street scene; and
- The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers, with reference to the potential use of the proposal as a self-contained unit.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi detached two storey house located at the corner of Ravensbury Road at its junction with Chequers Close (the Close). It has previously been the subject of a single storey front and side extension. It has a front garden with some off street parking and a relatively small rear garden, with a fenced off area for additional off street parking that sits to the rear of the existing side extension.
5. The local area is predominantly made of similarly sized semi-detached properties to the appeal property. Ravensbury Road rises steeply towards its junction with the Close and on the opposite corner of the junction is a stand-alone detached property. The houses in the Close are in a staggered terrace form with small front gardens, and the terraces start to the rear of the gardens of the appeal property and the detached house opposite.
6. The proposal constitutes a revision to a previously refused application¹ for a similar first floor extension. The proposal is now for a first floor side and rear extension that would have a spiral form of external staircase to its rear, which would connect it with the rear garden. The proposal would be the full length of the existing single storey side extension but would be set in approximately 1 metre in from its side flank wall, which sits on the boundary of the appeal property with the public highway. The roof of the proposal would be in a hipped roof form that would connect into the side slope of the hipped roof to the existing house, significantly below its existing terminal ridge. The proposal includes a single window to the front, two windows to the side and glazed doors to the rear that would provide access to the proposed rear staircase.
7. Although the proposal would add a significant extension at first floor level, this would be above and set back from the flank wall of the existing single storey side extension and would not further extend the footprint of the appeal property. The proposed setback from the existing ground floor flank wall, roof form and roof line, which would be lower than that of the main house, would result in it appearing as a subservient addition to the main house and less intrusive in the street scene than the existing single storey flat roofed side extension.
8. Given that the appeal property is on a corner plot that faces onto Ravensbury Road, it has a rear garden bordering the Close. As such, I do not find that the addition of a first floor extension above an existing ground floor extension would have a direct visual relationship with the building line of the staggered terraced properties on the Close that are somewhat distant from the appeal property.
9. The proposed external spiral staircase would be set to the rear of the proposed extension and would be positioned to align with its inner flank wall. As such,

¹ Planning Ref: 21/04576/FULL6

the proposed staircase would be set in from boundaries and sit well below the eaves and would not appear as intrusive or dominant in views of the appeal property from the Close or neighbouring properties

10. For these reasons, I do not find that the proposal would appear as an addition that would result in the appeal property appearing dominant in views from within the local area or cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene of the local area.

Living Conditions

11. Although the proposed extension would have an external staircase with the sole function of connecting the proposal with the appeal property's rear garden, the proposal includes an internal connecting door to the first floor landing of the existing house. The submitted plans show the proposed extension as being used as an additional bedroom with ensuite facilities.
12. The proposal before me is for an extension that would be integrated with the existing house and does not include proposals for any use other than the existing use of the appeal property as a dwelling. As such, I attach little weight to the Council's concerns that the proposal has the potential to be used as a stand-alone self-contained unit that would be detrimental to the amenities of occupants of neighbouring residential properties.
13. For these reasons I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conditions

14. As well as the standard conditions relating to the timing of implementation and drawings, I have applied a condition requiring materials to be used for the proposal to match those of the host dwelling, this is to ensure design quality. To protect privacy, I have also imposed a condition relating to the ensuite glazing at first floor level.

Conclusion

15. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR