



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3302717

13 Broadcroft Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, Bromley, BR5 1ET

- 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 Y Han against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/01192/FULL6, dated 18 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a conservatory to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of a conservatory to the rear at 13 Broadcroft Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, Bromley BR5 1ET, in accordance with the terms of the application DC/22/01192/FULL6, dated 18 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 plan: 900-09992

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions on neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a semi-detached house in a predominantly residential area made up of houses of similar design and scale. It has been the subject of two previous extensions, a rear dormer extension and a single storey rear flat roofed extension. This existing rear extension is the full width of the rear of the host dwelling and extends approximately 4.6 Metres.
4. The proposal is for a fully glazed conservatory extension with a white frame and upstand, and with a hipped roof form. The proposal would be attached to and centred on the end of the existing extension at the rear of the host dwelling. At approximately 4.4 Metres in width, the proposal would be slightly narrower than the approximate 4.8 Metre width of the existing rear extension and would project rearward by approximately 3.5 Metres. The eaves height of the proposal would be below the height of the existing rear extension and the ridge of the roof approximately 0.5 Metres taller than the 2.9 Metres height of

the flat roof of the existing rear extension. The limited scale, height and hipped roof form of the proposed conservatory would result in it appearing as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling.

5. The rear elevation of the proposed conservatory would be approximately 8.1 Metres from the rear of the original house. However, the proposed conservatory would be located in the context of a detached garage at No.11 and a shed/outhouse at the adjoining semi-detached house at No.15. This would position the proposed conservatory within a range of other existing rear extensions, detached garages and sheds and outhouses that are located at the rear of neighbouring and surrounding dwellings on this part of the street.
6. Given the recessive height and scale of the proposal in relation to the existing rear extension and the light and glazed nature of its construction, the proposal would not appear as unduly visually prominent or have a dominant presence. The effect of the presence of the proposal would be further mitigated by the existing tall timber fence between the host dwelling and No.15 and its setting within the context of other buildings and structures that I have identified. Therefore, the proposal would not have an overbearing effect on outlook when viewed from the rear rooms or garden of No.15.
7. For these reasons, I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling at No.15. The proposal would, therefore, accord with policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and paragraph 130 the National Planning policy Framework (2021), which collectively seek to ensure that development does not undermine the quality of life of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conditions

8. Along with the standard condition for timing of implementation, to assure design quality I have attached a condition requiring compliance with the approved drawing. As the materials to be used for the proposal are detailed on this approved drawing and are different from those used for the existing building, I have not included the condition proposed by the Council that would require matching materials.

Conclusion

9. The appeal is allowed

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR