



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/20/3256161

45 Brooklyn Road, Bromley BR2 9SD

- 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 Pooja Aggarwal against the decision of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/01154/FULL6, dated 22 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is ground floor and first floor rear extension, façade alterations, floor plan redesign and all associated works at 45 Brooklyn Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Number 45 Brooklyn Road is a two-storey semi-detached house which occupies a broadly triangular shaped plot towards the far end of a residential cul-de-sac. Houses along Brooklyn Road are predominantly semi-detached and set behind deep front gardens and driveways. Many of these properties have been extended to the side, rear and at roof level.
4. The host property has an existing single-storey rear extension and two-storey side extension which projects a short distance beyond its main rear elevation. The existing first floor extension is offset from, and only slightly narrower in width than the main rear elevation making it a prominent addition. The proposed extension, even though it would be set below the eaves height of the main roof, would increase the size and bulk of this first floor extension. This would overwhelm the host property against which it would appear disproportionately large and dominant. Whilst it would integrate with the existing building through the use of matching materials, its combined bulk with the existing first floor extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property.
5. The ground floor extension in combination with the existing extension, due to its width would be a large addition. However, a generous area of garden would be retained and the extension, being at ground floor, would be less dominant and would not detract from the overall form of the building.

6. The proposed development would not be easily visible from the street or the public realm as it would be behind the existing side extension. However, the disproportionately large and dominant first floor extension would be clearly visible from a number of neighbouring properties and their gardens. Several properties within the locality have been extended, including Number 47 Brooklyn Road which has a first floor extension. However, this adjacent extension is not as wide or dominant on the host property as the appeal proposal is. It is therefore not comparable.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016¹. These policies together require a high standard of design and the scale and form of residential developments to respect the host dwelling.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR

¹ The London Plan: The spatial development strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011 (March 2016)