



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2020

by David Cliff BA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/20/3255718

2 Harting Road, Mottingham, London SE9 4JR

- 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 E Ofori Darko against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/20/01513/FULL6, dated 24 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as 'additional single storey extension above partially constructed ground floor extension (approved DC/19/01442/FULL) to create two storey extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Construction work has commenced on a side extension at ground floor level. Planning permission has previously been granted for a single storey side extension. The proposed development the subject of this appeal would comprise a two storey side extension and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at a prominent corner plot. Other than the partially constructed ground floor extension, there is a considerable gap between the main two storey side wall of the original dwelling and the adjacent boundary with Court Farm Road. This layout is generally typical of the layout of houses on corner plots within the surrounding residential area with sizeable distances from the main side walls to the adjacent boundary with the highway.
5. This pattern of development creates a degree of spaciousness on corner plots at the end of the residential terraces, contributing positively to the overall character and appearance of the area. In the case of the appeal site, the open woodland on the opposite side of Court Farm Road also adds positively to the

overall character and appearance of this road. The properties on the east side of Court Farm road are also set back from the front of their plots.

6. The proposed extension would be close to the side boundary of the site. Whilst a small gap would be retained, due to its two storey form and massing, it would appear as being visually intrusive and unacceptably cramped in this corner plot location. The two storey side wall, so close to the side boundary, would also appear as visually dominant when viewed by pedestrians and the occupiers of vehicles passing the site.
7. I acknowledge that in some views along Court Farm Road, the extension would be viewed against the backdrop of existing houses. However, this would only mitigate its overall impact to a limited degree and the extension would still appear as particularly intrusive in views in close proximity to the site.
8. At my site visit I observed other extensions to residential properties in the surrounding locality including those highlighted by the appellant. However, these differ from the appeal proposal in that they either maintain greater distances to the side boundary than the appeal proposal or they are not on corner plots adjacent to the public highway.
9. Although the proposal has been designed with a hipped roof and has been stepped back from the front elevation of the property, these factors do not override the harm I found to result from the proximity of the two storey extension to the boundary of this corner site. Whilst, a single storey extension has been permitted with a similar footprint, the two storey proposal would be of a significantly greater height, bulk and massing resulting in harm to the streetscene as described above.
10. I therefore find that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to the design aims of Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan January 2019. It would also be contrary to the relevant design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other matters

11. Whilst no harm would result to the living conditions of the occupiers of any neighbouring properties or upon highway safety, these are neutral matters in my considerations and do not weigh significantly in favour of the proposal.
12. I have taken into consideration the previous appeal decision¹. That decision related to an earlier proposal for a single storey extension and I am satisfied that there is no inconsistency between my findings and that decision.
13. Whilst the appellant is seeking to provide sufficient space for his family, this does not outweigh the harm I found to result from the proposed extension.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cliff

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/G5180/D/18/3217138