
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2017

by Oliver Blower MA (T&CP)

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 18 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3176465

9 Glentrammon Road, Orpington, Kent BR6 6DE

- 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 James Wratten against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/00869/FULL6, dated 22 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "*rear 2 storey extension replacing conservatory & providing one addition [sic] rear bedroom*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has raised no objections to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the house or area. Based on my own observations I find no reason to disagree. I therefore consider the one main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 7 Glentrammon Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey detached dwelling situated on higher land to the east of No 7 Glentrammon Road. The proposed development is for a two-storey hipped roof rear extension approximately 3.9m deep, located approximately 1.4m away from the boundary of No 7.
 4. Due to the significant difference in levels between No 7 and No 9, the flank wall of the proposed extension would appear excessively high. This, in conjunction with its depth and proximity, would result in a substantial diminution of daylight to the rear windows and glazed conservatory of No 7. It would also prevent sunlight reaching the rear windows and conservatory of No 7 in the early morning during the summer months, leading to overshadowing.
 5. I acknowledge that the proposal would broadly follow the footprint of the existing conservatory, and that there is sufficient space to accommodate a garage close to the boundary of No 7. Nevertheless, the excessive height and scale of the proposed flank wall would result in a severe sense of enclosure when viewed from the rear ground floor window of No 12, whereby it is set back from the features projecting out to either side so that only limited daylight
-

and a narrow aspect remain. Thus the extension would appear overbearing and visually intrusive.

6. I observed at my site visit that No 31 Glentrammon Road has a large rear projection, however it is located a greater distance away from its closest neighbour at No 29. I also observed that the rear projection at No 27 is set in from the side of the main house and back from its boundary with No 25 Glentrammon Road. Thus these examples are not directly comparable to the proposal before me.
7. Consequently, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living condition of the occupiers of No 7. It is therefore contrary to policy BE1 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006), which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that development respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and ensure their environments are not harmed by inadequate daylight, sunlight or by overshadowing. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Oliver Blower

Appointed Person