



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2023

by C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3315733

8 Heath Park Drive, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2WQ

- 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 Ambrish Agarwal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/03767/FULL6, dated 24 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the conservatory and replacing it with a double-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the conservatory and replacing it with a double-storey extension at 8 Heath Park Drive, Bickley, Bromley BR1 2WQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/03767/FULL6, dated 24 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: HP-1204-PRE Rev: V5, HP-1204-PGF Rev: V5, HP-1204-PTV Rev: V3, HP-1204-PFF Rev: V5, HP-1204-PLSE Rev: V3, HP-1204-PRSE Rev: V3 and HP-1204-BP Rev: V4.
 - 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Reasons

3. The existing property is a large, relatively modern, detached dwelling made from red brick with a pitched tile roof. The property has benefitted from several significant additions and extensions over the years. While these additions have altered the appearance of the rear of the property, the character of the original dwelling house is still readily apparent when viewed from the front.
4. The proposed extension would be no taller than the existing ridge height, meaning that it is not likely that it would be visible from the front of the property. At ground floor level, the extension would not extend beyond the

existing rear elevation of the property. At first floor level, it would represent a relatively significant addition that would add bulk and mass to the rear of the building. However, given that the overall footprint of the house would not be extended, the proposed extension would have the visual effect of 'squaring off' the building, rather than forming an obvious or incongruous addition.

5. The substantial mass of the existing building means that the extension would not appear to dominate or detract from its appearance, and it would be seen as a proportionate and sympathetic addition when viewed from the rear. While there are some differences in architectural detailing, the materials used would complement and match the existing property.
6. As a result, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and it therefore conforms with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan, January 2019. Taken together, these policies allow development that is of a good design, and in particular, residential extensions that respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Other Matters

7. While the proposal would increase the size of the property, it would still be of a similar size to many dwellings in the vicinity, and a good size rear garden would be retained. It would therefore not appear as being out of keeping with the wider character of the area.
8. Given that the proposed extension would not extend the footprint of the property, and would be no higher than the existing ridgeline, I am satisfied that there would be no further opportunities for overlooking neighbouring gardens than currently exists. In addition, the extension would not project any further forward than the northern elevation of the neighbouring property at No. 7, and there are no windows on the west elevation of that property. As a result, the occupants of No. 7 would not experience any loss of daylight or privacy.
9. Given that I have found that the proposed extension would not cause harm, I am content that there is no issue in terms of setting an unacceptable precedent. Any other schemes that come forward for neighbouring properties would need to be considered on their individual merits. I also have no evidence before me to suggest that the proposed development would lead to an unacceptable increase in traffic or street parking.
10. Third party comments have been made in relation to previously approved extensions on the property. However, it is not for me to comment on previous development that has taken place. Concerns have also been raised about the number of people living in the property and the implications for council tax, as well as the impact of the proposal on neighbouring property prices. These are not planning issues that would alter my decision. The Council also appears to have conformed with the requirement to notify neighbouring properties about the application and provide interested parties with sufficient time to provide responses.
11. The possible future use of the property is not an issue I can consider. However, any further proposals would either need to adhere to the legislation concerning permitted development rights or would require approval from the Council.

12. The proposal would provide accommodation suitable for the appellant's elderly parents and their particular health needs. However, as I have found that the proposal would be acceptable, it is not necessary for me to further consider the appellant's personal circumstances.

Conditions

13. In the interests of clarity and certainty, I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to identify the relevant plans. I have also imposed a condition on materials to ensure that the proposed extension conforms with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
14. Given the limited nature of the proposal, a condition to require a construction management plan is not necessary.

Conclusion

15. The proposed development conforms with the development plan when considered as a whole. As a result, I allow the appeal.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR