
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by David Walker MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22nd June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3169865

Mayfield Lodge, Kingswood Road, Shortlands, Bromley BR2 0HQ

- 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 Nick McAdam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/04497/FULL1, dated 14 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the area
 - ii) living conditions in relation to scale and proximity and having regard to the availability of privacy, light and outlook, and
 - iii) living conditions in relation to the adequacy of the external living space that would remain.

Reasons

3. The proposed development is a rear extension that due to a significant change in levels between the appeal site and adjoining land would be prominent from Green Close. While other buildings are also of a large scale and elevated, the extension would create an uncharacteristically long building that would be atypical of the residential properties viewed in the street scene.
 4. From Green Close the extended dwelling would appear to loom over the modest bungalows of the close leading to a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. I acknowledge that the design and materials proposed would reflect that of the host dwelling but these alone would be insufficient to reduce the harm.
 5. The proposal would accordingly conflict with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 (the UDP) that require development to not detract from the existing streetscene and be compatible with existing development in the surrounding areas, amongst other considerations.
 6. Turning to living conditions. The proposal would project closer to the boundary with the neighbouring property at No 1 Green Close. Although the nearest part
-

would be of a single storey the bulk of the extension would reach to the full height of the existing dwelling. Coupled with its elevated position the scale of such an extension would have a domineering presence resulting in an overbearing effect. It would be harmful to the living conditions of the neighbour.

7. Additionally, the two storey extension would introduce new windows at the upper floor level that would provide opportunities for the direct overlooking of the rear of No 1. The effect would be offset to a degree by the removal of an existing rear facing window. But with a net increase in the opportunities for overlooking there would be a worsening of the existing conditions for the neighbour leading to harm to living conditions.
8. The southerly position of the appeal site in relation to No 1 could impact on the availability of direct sunlight but there is no evidence to show this would be harmful. In relation to external living space, with some 65% of the whole plot remaining undeveloped sufficient garden space would exist to serve the needs of a family. However, the harm to the living conditions of the neighbour brings the proposal into conflict with Policy BE1 of the UDP and its requirement for development to respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR