



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2024 by S Indermaur MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3344483

64 Hayes Chase, West Wickham, Bromley BR4 0JA

- 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 Mr Emin Lecaj against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/00972/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing garage and the erection of a part one/two storey side and rear extension, a front extension incorporating a porch and new bay window, a loft conversion incorporating a new hipped roof at steeper pitch, rear dormer, juliet balcony and elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part one/two storey side and rear extension, a front extension incorporating a porch and a new bay window, loft conversion incorporating a new hipped roof at steeper pitch, rear dormer, Juliet balcony and elevational alterations at 64 Hayes Chase, West Wickham, Bromley BR4 0JA. In accordance with the terms of application DC/24/00972/FULL6 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 approved plans: 329-01-P1, 329-100-P1, 329-101-P1, 329-102-P1, 329-103-P1, 329-104-P1, 329-105-P1, 329-106-P1 and 329-107-P1.
 - 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.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the proposed first-floor side window at 64 Hayes Chase, West Wickham, Bromley BR4 0JA has been fitted with obscured glazing. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof set within a reasonably wide plot, which is characteristic of the street scene. It was noted on the site visit that the garage had been demolished.
5. There is a gap between the host dwelling and the shared boundary with No.66, which is also replicated between No.62 and the host dwelling. There are examples of dwellings that have been extended to the side, close to shared boundaries and some have added floor extensions. The immediate neighbour at No.66 has extended up to the shared boundary with the host dwelling at ground floor level and is of a similar character and appearance. This neighbouring property also has a first-floor side extension that is set down from the existing ridge, set back significantly from the front façade, with around 1 metre space between it and the appeal property.
6. Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (LP) states that the Council would normally require a minimum of 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site to be retained for the full height and length of the building, where extensions of two or more storeys are proposed. The expectation is that the retention of space around residential buildings would ensure adequate separation and would prevent a cramped appearance and unrelated terracing from occurring.
7. The proposed side extension would retain a separation gap of 1m to the flank boundary at first floor level, however, the ground floor element would abut the shared boundary. Nevertheless, taken in conjunction with the first-floor element also being set back and the roof set down from the existing ridge with a similar hipped form, the proposal has been designed to avoid the creation of a terracing effect. Furthermore, and in the context of the street scene and the retention of a 1 metre gap at first floor level, I am satisfied that sufficient space would be retained to ensure visual separation from the neighbouring properties.
8. Therefore, whilst the proposal would in part conflict with Policy 8 in respect of the ground floor element, the existing gaps between the appeal property and neighbouring properties would be sufficiently respected so as not to result in a cramped appearance.
9. I have had regard to No.66, which exhibits a similar extension to the proposal, and which it is indicated that the Council previously allowed. This development, along with other side extensions viewed within the street scene form part of the character of area and clearly demonstrate a design and extent of setback that respects and is compatible with the scale and form of development in the surrounding area. I find that this lends some additional weight in support of the proposed development.
10. The Council has also drawn my attention to Section D of DG5 guidance note from the Bromley Urban Design Guide (2023). This is in respect of roof forms relating to size, reducing visual impact on the street scene and positively responding to the character of the area. In this instance, I am satisfied that the

proposed roof form is not uncharacteristic of this area and would not represent an inappropriate form of development.

11. The proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, although there would be some limited conflict with Policy 8 of the LP which normally requires a minimum of 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site to be retained for the full height and length of the building, the proposal would accord with Policies 6 and 37 of the LP, which together seek development that is of a high-quality design and are compatible with surrounding development.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, a condition has been recommended requiring the development accord with the approved plans, as this would provide certainty and precision. A condition to ensure that the external finishing materials of the extension match those of the existing dwelling, would be in the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and immediate area.
13. The Council have requested a condition regarding the use and retention of obscure glazing to the proposed first floor side windows, which I agree would be in the interests of the living conditions of the neighbouring dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions as listed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR