



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: 24 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3315811

55 Allen Road, Bromley, Beckenham BR3 4NU

- 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 Sarah Hall against the decision of The Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/03451/FULL6, dated 31 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear kitchen and lean to; erection of a single storey rear extension with light lantern; and loft conversion with rear dormer, Juliet balcony and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing rear kitchen and lean to; erection of a single storey rear extension with light lantern; and loft conversion with rear dormer, Juliet balcony and front rooflights at 55 Allen Road, Bromley, Beckenham BR3 4NU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/03451/FULL6, dated 31 August 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: D1099-3 (Location and Block Plans) and D1099-2 (Proposed Plans and Elevations).
 - 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. As the Council's reasons for refusal relate solely to the proposed single storey rear extension, I must assume that it has no objections to the other elements of the proposal. I agree with this approach, and I have therefore only considered the single storey rear extension.

Main Issues:

3. I agree with the Council that the proposed extension would not adversely impact on No. 57. As a result, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 53, with particular respect to outlook, daylight and privacy.

Reasons

4. The host dwelling is a two storey mid-terraced property constructed of red brick with a pitched tile roof and a good length garden to the rear. While the proposed rear extension would project quite far out from the existing dwelling, it would only be single storey with a flat roof. As a result, when seen in the context of the existing two storey property, it would not be overly dominant or visually intrusive. The remaining rear garden would still be of a sufficient size for its purpose, which would help to ensure that the proposed extension would not appear too large or out of place.
5. The Council has set out the reasons why the rear extension at No. 49 was permitted. However, there are also several other examples of similar sized rear extensions in Allen Road and the surrounding area. As a result, the proposed development would not appear to be unusual or out of character. The Council acknowledges that the materials to be used, including the brick work, would respect the appearance of the existing property, thereby ensuring that the overall result would be quite harmonious.
6. During my site visit, I observed that No. 53 does have a rear extension which projects some way beyond the original rear elevation of that property. The proposed development at No. 55 would extend further than that. However, given that it would only be a single storey structure, its height and overall mass would be relatively modest. This means that, even taking into account the orientation of the buildings, it is unlikely that it would reduce the amount of daylight reaching the rear windows of No. 53 to any meaningful degree. The limited height of the structure also means that it would not impact on the outlook of the occupiers of that property or create a sense of enclosure.
7. The Council's officer report refers to a reduction in privacy for the occupiers of No. 53, although this isn't reflected in the decision notice. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the single storey nature of the proposed extension could not lead to any harm in this regard.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal is in accordance with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan, January 2019, which taken together, permit well designed residential extensions and development that respects the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

9. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed conditions to identify the relevant timescales and plans. A further condition to require matching materials is necessary to ensure that the development adheres to existing character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development is in accordance with the development plan when considered as a whole. Having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR