



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2024 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3346040

12 Keswick Road, Orpington, Bromley BR6 0EU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Phil Carrivick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/01037/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as 'first floor extension above existing garage and kitchen and new porch'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension above existing garage and kitchen and new porch at 12 Keswick Road, Orpington BR6 0EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/24/01037/FULL6 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos 0212/02, 0212/04, 0212/06, 0212/08, 0212/10, 0212/12 and 0212/12 (proposed block plan).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The description above is taken from the application form which sufficiently identifies the elements that make up the proposals. The form also refers to rendering, matching materials, structural matters and reasons for the proposals as well as how the scheme might integrate successfully. Whilst I have taken this commentary into account, I have not included it above for conciseness. This does not fundamentally affect the scheme for which planning permission is sought.
4. The Council's reason for refusal refers to the proposed two storey extension, implying that they do not object to the scheme's other elements. I have no

reason to disagree, and my recommendation focuses on the same. Specifically, its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a detached dwelling on a corner plot within a residential area that is characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings. There are a variety of forms and designs that occupy corner plots with varying distances to boundaries and differing boundary treatments. The single storey side elevation of the property forms part of the boundary alongside the pavement. On the frontage, the property is set back from the roadside.
6. The proposed extension would be visible from the surrounding area due to the open nature of the site. The extended part will be over an existing single storey part of the dwelling to create two storeys. Although there would not be a 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site to the extension, the development would not create a cramped appearance as highlighted in the supporting text of Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) (LP) and will still retain a more than sufficient degree of visual openness. Mainly due to the fact that the extended section of the building would abut a side road. I am also mindful of the fact that Policy 8 is concerned with what would 'normally' be required for side space purposes.
7. The extension would incorporate a gable frontage in line with the existing property with a pitch that slopes towards the existing building creating a subordinate appearance. Given the spacious nature of the junction with a pavement each side, the frontage being set back from the roadside and the extension being in line with the height of the existing dwelling, the proposal will retain a sense of openness. It would therefore be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies 6 and 37 of the LP which are concerned with the development being compatible with the surrounding area amongst other things.

Conditions

8. Other than the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to materials to match that of the existing dwelling is also necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out.

L Clark APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, subject to the above conditions.

John Morrison INSPECTOR