



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3260117 17 Recreation Road, Bromley BR2 0DY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Ms Claire Deane against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/02444/HHPA, dated 14 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear/side extension with side sloping roof with roof windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval granted under the provision of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) for single storey rear/side extension with side sloping roof with roof windows at 17 Recreation Road, Bromley BR2 0DY in accordance with application Ref DC/20/02444/HHPA, dated 14 July 2020, and the details submitted with it, including the following plans: 1:1250 Location Plan, 1:500 existing block plan, 1:500 proposed block plan, CD/19/01 and CD/20/02A, pursuant to Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, paragraph A.4 of the GPDO.

Procedural Matter

2. The provisions of the GPDO require the local planning authority to assess the proposed development solely on the basis of its impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received. My determination of this appeal has been made in the same manner.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the amenity of any adjoining premises.

Reasons

4. Number 17 Recreation Road (No 17) is a small two-storey mid-terrace property with an existing single-storey rear addition. Its garden adjoins the garden of Number 15 Recreation Road (No 15) from which it is separated by a tall wooden fence which extends along the full boundary length. Both Nos 15 and 17 have single-storey rear extensions. The proposed extension would infill the area between the existing rear extension and the boundary with No 15. It

- would extend 5.3 metres along this boundary with a mono-pitched roof and an eaves height indicated to be 1.8 metres.
5. No 15 is positioned at a lower level than No 17. It has a glazed patio door to the garden in the main rear elevation and two windows within its rear addition, facing towards the existing boundary fence. The extension would have an eaves height to a similar level as the existing boundary fence. As the height on the boundary would be similar to the existing timber fence together with the sloping roof rising away from the boundary, the extension would not lead to a significantly greater sense of enclosure or tunnelling effect than currently experienced from this property.
 6. Due to the orientation of the rear elevation of No 15 and the path of the sun, the north-east facing patio doors would currently receive some sunlight in the morning. The windows within No 15's single-storey extension which face south-east towards the boundary are identified as secondary windows serving a kitchen and bathroom. The sunlight to this neighbouring property is already affected by the boundary fence and No 17's existing single-storey extension. Since the proposed extension would be no higher than this and the same height on the boundary as the fence, the effect of the proposal on sunlight and daylight to the neighbouring property would not be significant. Furthermore, the patio doors are not the only source of natural light to the room they serve as it also benefits from a window in the front elevation of the property.
 7. The extension would be far enough away from site boundaries to avoid an impact on the amenity of other adjoining neighbours at Number 19 Recreation Road and the primary school to the rear.

Conclusion

8. For these reasons, I find the proposal would not cause an unacceptable impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR