



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 March 2023

by A Wright BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 MARCH 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3313878

1 Mickleham Close, Bromley, Orpington BR5 2SN

- 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 Shuquary Morina against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/03575/FULL6, dated 9 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2022.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'single-storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for Single storey side extension, single storey side infill extension and elevational alterations at 1 Mickleham Close, Bromley, Orpington BR5 2SN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/03575/FULL6, dated 9 September 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: M1-1, M1-02, M1-03, M1-04, M1-05, M1-06, M1-07, M1-08, M1-09 and M1-10.
 - 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. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises a single storey side extension, single storey side infill extension and elevational alterations. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis and so shall I. The decision in paragraph 1 above reflects this approach.
3. The Council does not raise objections to the proposed single storey side infill extension, and I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

4. Having regard to the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposed single story side extension and elevational alterations on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The site comprises a two-storey end of terrace house within a residential area. The appeal dwelling is located on a corner site, with its entrance through a previous single storey extension facing Mickleham Close. The side elevations of the house face Mickleham Road and the property's rear garden. The other four dwellings in the terrace face Mickleham Road, and some of these have been extended to the front, including No 42 Mickleham Road (No 42) which adjoins the appeal site. The row of terrace houses on the opposite corner of Mickleham Close are of a similar original design and the wider area comprises a mix of terraced and semi-detached dwellings and flats.
6. As the appeal dwelling is set back from the building line of the other properties on the Mickleham Road elevation and there are existing road facing extensions, there is little symmetry to the terrace. The width of the extension would result in it projecting forward of the original building line of the house and the other properties in the terrace along Mickleham Road. It would be a larger scale than other road facing extensions in the area and its roof would project slightly higher than the extension at No 42. However, the development would have a similar eaves height and project no further forward than the neighbouring extension so its scale would not be excessive. Furthermore, its roof design and finishing materials would reflect those of the existing house. As a result, the proposal would not harm the appearance of the appeal dwelling or terrace.
7. The extension would be located on a prominent corner site, visible from Mickleham Road and Mickleham Close. Whilst the original form of the two terrace blocks on the opposite sides of Mickleham Close was largely the same, the appeal property and others within the terrace have been extended at single storey and the symmetry at ground floor between the blocks is less apparent in the street scene. Further, the two blocks are separated by the road, grass verges and footpaths, and by good sized side garden areas. This separation and the single storey design of the proposal limits the effect of the extension on their original symmetry. The changes to the roof of the existing front extension and new window openings would be inconsequential. Therefore, the proposed single storey addition and elevational alterations would not appear incongruous in the street scene.
8. I conclude that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. It would comply with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan January 2016 which require developments to respect the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area. It would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. To protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external materials used in the construction of the extension will match those of the existing building.

10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan and the Framework, and therefore the appeal is allowed.

A Wright , INSPECTOR