



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2023

by R Lawrence MRTPI, BSc (hons), PGDip (TP)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3319225

16A Cameron Road, Bromley, BR2 9AR

- 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 - Lonsdale against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/22/04073/FULL6, dated 14 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is to increase the height of the roof to the existing garage by 1530mm and extend to the side by 8sqm to allow for the existing 1st floor to be used.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to increase the height of the roof to the existing garage by 1530mm and extend to the side by 8sqm to allow for the existing 1st floor to be used at 16A Cameron Road, Bromley, BR2 9AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/22/04073/FULL6, dated 18 October 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing garage building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2.1 Proposed Site Location Plan, 2.2 Proposed Floor Plans, 2.2 Proposed Roof Plan, 2.3 Proposed Elevations (North and East), 2.3 Proposed Elevations (South and West) and 2.4 Proposed Section.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Lonsdale against the Council of the London Borough of Bromley. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. I note that the Council has amended the description of development from that set out on the planning application form. I have referred to the description of development on the planning application form, as applied for by the appellant.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within a residential area which is characterised by large, detached properties, set within generous plots. The appeal property is of a more contemporary style and appearance compared with the wider street scene. The existing garage is set back from the frontage, although nonetheless appears visible in the wider street scene. Whilst the extended garage would be large, there is a modest set back from the road and in the context of the host property and wider street scene which are characterised by large, detached properties. The building would clearly appear subservient in scale due to a lower eaves, ridge height and footprint compared to the host dwelling, and as such would not appear overbearing. The style and materials of the garage would complement the contemporary style of the host dwelling, and overall, I find that the extended garage would sit comfortably within its setting.
6. I note that a flank elevation, due to the orientation of the garage, would face the street. Notwithstanding the lack of windows, there is sufficient architectural detail by way of variation in materials together with variation in texture on the garage, such to blend in with its surroundings.
7. The Council's second reason for refusal relates to the potential for the extended building to form a separate independent dwelling. However, the appeal scheme is clearly for a building ancillary to the use of the host property. Whilst the extended garage would be large, separate permissions would be required for any conversion to a separate dwelling. As such, I have considered the appeal scheme on its merits and on the basis of the submitted plans. Having regard to the above considerations, I find that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that by reason of its subordinate scale together with style and materials to match the host dwelling, the proposal would achieve a high quality design and would be compatible with the character and appearance of the area. As a result, there would be no conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the LP as it would accord with the requirements within to complement the scale, form and materials of the host dwelling, and in general terms would achieve a high-quality design.
9. The Local Authority has referred to Policy 9 – Residential Conversions, of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 (LP) in their second reason for refusal. The policy seeks to control the conversion of a single dwelling into two or more self-contained residential units. There is no substantive evidence before me which details how this policy relates to the appeal scheme. The proposal is for extensions to an existing outbuilding and is not for the sub-division of a dwelling. As such, I find no conflict with the requirements of Policy 9.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard condition which would limit the lifespan of the planning permission, I have specified the approved plans in the interests of clarity. A condition requiring matching materials would be necessary to ensure

that the appearance of the new detached garage would be satisfactory and would protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.

R. Lawrence

INSPECTOR