



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/22/3303727

19 Grosvenor Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, Bromley, BR5 1QT

- 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 Hung Truong against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application Ref DC/22/01336/FULL6, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing attached garage and erection of two storey side/rear extension and internal layout alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing attached garage and erection of two storey side/rear extension and internal layout alterations at 19 Grosvenor Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, Bromley BR5 1QT in accordance with the terms of the application, DC/22/01336/FULL6, dated 29 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: GROA_v0801 A1AC_0101xc, GROA_v0801 A2AE_0401pf, GROA_v0801 A2BE_0101pf, GROA_v0801 A2AE_0201pf, GROA_v0801 A2AD_0101pf, GROA_v0801 A2BE_0301pf, GROA_v0801 A2CE_0101pf and GROA_v0801 A2AE_0101pf,
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. Revisions were made to the proposal by the appellant during the consideration of the planning application by the Council and prior to their decision. My consideration of this appeal has, therefore, been carried out with reference to the revised drawings and I have used the revised description from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a hipped roofed two storey detached house with good sized front and rear gardens and an attached single storey double garage. It sits in an area of similarly scaled detached and semi-detached houses. There is significant variety in design and separating space between the houses on the street, many of which appear to have been the subject of extensive alteration and extension, including the host dwelling. It is located within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (the ASRC), which reflects the principles of Garden City Suburb design, where the separation between buildings and their rhythm and pattern. This results in a degree of openness that allows for through views to mature trees and planting.
5. The proposal involves the demolition of the existing double garage that is set well back from the front elevation of the main dwelling. This would be replaced by a two storey extension that would wrap around the side and a large part of the rear of the host dwelling. To the front, the proposal would incorporate a two storey gable ended bay that would reflect the design of the two storey bay on the existing front elevation.
6. The extent of the existing garage and the gap at first and roof level does appear as an anomaly within the context of the frontages of existing detached and semi-detached houses facing the street, which demonstrate less generous gaps. The extent of the double garage and concomitant gap between houses therefore results in a weak element in the existing defined building frontage, which does not accord with the predominant rhythm and appearance of the local streetscene.
7. The main part of the proposed side extension would be set back approximately 1 Metre from the front elevation of the host dwelling, with a further small set back as it nears to the boundary with the neighbouring property at 17 Grosvenor Road (No.17). The flank wall of the proposal would be approximately 2 Metres from the boundary with No.17. This would result in a separating gap between the two houses that would appear to be in excess of 3 Metres, this would reflect the extent of separating gap between houses in the local area and the characteristics of the ARSC. To the rear, the proposal would have a slight projection from the existing rearmost part of the host dwelling and would reference art deco in its design, reflective of the period and character of properties in the local area, adding interest to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. The roof of the proposal as a whole would integrate with the existing roof, resulting in a hipped roof appearance, but with an extensive crown roof form. From surrounding views this crowned roof form would not be readily apparent, and the hipped roof appearance would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the local area.
9. From the front, the proposal would result in the appeal property appearing as a significantly larger dwelling and would reduce the space between the appeal property and the neighbouring property at No.17, infilling the existing gap between the host dwelling and No.17 at first and roof levels. Although the proposal would result in a larger house than the existing, this would reflect the streetscene of the area, where detached and semi-detached houses have been individually altered and extended in a variety of scales, forms and finishes, but retaining a characteristic separating distance between properties.

10. The generous width of the appeal plot, the proposed gap between the flank of the proposal and No.17 and the setting back of the front elevation of the proposal from the existing front elevation, would allow the proposal to sit comfortably with the host dwelling and result in it appearing cramped on its plot. This would reflect the quality of design and spatial characteristics of the local area and the wider ASRC.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would appear as subservient to the host dwelling and would not appear incongruous in relation to its character and appearance. The proposal would not, therefore result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or that of the local area and the characteristics of the ASRC.

Conditions

12. Along with the standard conditions relating to the timing of implementation and compliance with approved plans, I have applied a condition to ensure design quality, which requires materials to be used for the proposal to match those of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

13. The appeal is allowed

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR