



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

by Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3308473

8 Trenear Close, Orpington, Bromley BR6 9XT

- 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 Parkash Venkateswaran Raman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/02356/FULL6, dated 10 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2022.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'erection of a first floor side extension with a bay window and replacement of the existing ground floor extension's flat roof to a pitched roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a first floor side extension with a bay window and replacement of the existing ground floor extension's flat roof to a pitched and hipped roof at 8 Trenear Close, Orpington, Bromley BR6 9XT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/02356/FULL6, dated 10 June 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: NP142239/LP; NP142239/BP; NP142239/E1; NP142239/E2; NP142239/A2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those materials specified on the approved plans and planning application form.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development in the above heading is taken from the planning application form. However, for precision I have made clear in the decision in paragraph 1 of this letter that a pitched and hipped roof is proposed over the existing ground floor extension.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site relates to a detached property towards the end of Trenear Close. The dwelling includes a front first floor square bay window. It also features a flat roofed rear extension, and a side projection with a pitched and hipped roof, both of which are single storey. The side projection extends beyond the front wall of the main part of the dwelling and provides a canopy over the front door.
5. The proposed first floor side extension would be set down from the ridge and set back from the front wall of the main part of the dwelling to a limited extent. Additionally, the proposed bay window would be similar in size to and project only slightly less than the existing one. Nevertheless, the side extension would be smaller in scale overall than the existing dwelling and thus be a subordinate addition. Moreover, No 7 is adjacent to the site and features a similar side extension with a first floor bay window. Further, there is some variety to the housing in the close, with many featuring prominent gabled elements. The design of the side extension would hence be compatible with nearby properties.
6. A gap would be retained between Nos 7 and 8 which would be comparable with the size of the gaps between other dwellings in the close such as Nos 1 to 4. The side extension would not appear cramped or undermine the spatial qualities of the close.
7. Visibility of the rear and side elements of the development would be limited due to the layout of the close and the site's set back position. In these respects, the proposal would also be compatible with the character and appearance of the close. Moreover, the Council has raised no objections to the pitched and hipped roof over the existing rear extension.
8. The drawings and the application form specify that the development would be constructed to match the surfacing materials of the existing dwelling, except for the roof of the ground floor extension, which would be constructed from pantiles. These materials would be compatible with the existing dwelling. The imposition of a planning condition to require the use of those materials would ensure that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposal accords with policies 6, 8 and 37 of the Council's Local Plan, which alongside other things set out design criteria, require that extensions should respect or complement host dwellings and their surroundings, and specify that space to the sides of buildings should be retained.

Conclusion

10. The proposal accords with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be taken which is contrary to the development plan. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.
11. In addition to the aforementioned materials condition, another is needed to clarify the standard time limit for implementing the scheme. Additionally, one is also needed for certainty to require that the development be carried out in accordance with the drawings.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR