
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by Gwyn Clark BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3169804

11 Lodge Close, Orpington BR6 0QQ

- 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 Tom Freeburne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/05307/FULL6, dated 20 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is ground floor front and side extensions and first floor extension to create a two storey dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note the appellant's assertion in his appeal statement that no single storey rear extension is proposed, as set out in the description of development on the Council's decision notice. I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans and the description of development on the planning application form. Neither indicate such an extension is proposed.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the first floor extension upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Lodge Close with regard to outlook and an overbearing effect, overshadowing and loss of sunlight and light.

Reasons

4. Lodge Close contains a mix of houses and bungalows arranged in a regular pattern generally following the alignment of the roadway. In most cases the gable end of one dwelling is positioned roughly adjacent to that of its neighbour. However this is not the case in respect of the relationship between No 11 and its neighbour (No 10). No 11 is situated at the 'shoulder' of the turning head, where the road changes direction to begin to form the vehicular turning space. This has had the effect of narrowing its front garden.
5. In order for the bungalow to be accommodated within the plot it has been set much further back and this has resulted in it standing slightly behind the rear elevation of its two storey neighbour. It stands alongside the neighbour's rear

garden and is separated from the boundary with No 10 by only a narrow footpath.

6. The extension proposed has been well designed to complement the style of the original bungalow and the character of the surrounding area. The roof of the new two storey dwelling would also be hipped away from the neighbour, and the first floor accommodation has been designed with a reduced height by utilising the roof space. However the first floor extension would still considerably increase the height of the existing bungalow.
7. As a result of the position the bungalow occupies in relation to No 10 and the narrowness of the gap between the two properties this increase in height would lead to a significant loss of light and overshadowing both of the rear of the neighbouring dwelling and of its garden. The closeness of the resulting two storey dwelling to the boundary with No 10 would also lead to a loss of outlook and have a harmful overbearing effect.
8. The proposal would conflict with Policy BE1 (v) of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006) which seeks to ensure that new development respects the amenity of neighbours by ensuring that their environment is not harmed by inadequate daylight, sunlight, privacy or by overshadowing.
9. My attention has been drawn to examples of other extensions that have been undertaken within the vicinity of the appeal site. However these do not display the same staggered relationship as exists between No 10 and No 11 Lodge Close and therefore the examples offered do not alter my decision.
10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gwyn Clark

INSPECTOR