

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2021

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3275094

6 Arragon Gardens, West Wickham BR4 9LJ

- 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 Mark Mills against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application, Ref. DC/20/04963/FULL6, dated 16 November 2020 was refused by notice dated 22 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a 5m single storey rear extension with a crown roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings, and (ii) the effect on the living conditions for the occupiers of the adjoining property at No. 8 as regards outlook.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal property is one half of a semi-detached pair with No. 8 and that at the side and rear nearest No. 4 there is a steeply pitched front gabled garage that adjoins a very similar garage at that property. The proposed addition would span the full width of the house with a depth of 5m, reduced from 6m in the previous application (Ref. 20/02345/FULL6), also refused permission by the Council.
 4. On the first issue, the Council considers that the 5m depth of the extension would be excessive and would not respect the scale and form of the host dwelling or that of the surrounding development. However, the grounds of appeal refer to a number of properties in the road that have had rear extensions and although not included in that analysis I saw that the adjoining house at No. No. 4 has already been extended to a scale and in a form not dissimilar to that proposed in this appeal application.
 5. The design of the extension with its hipped roof to the crown is acceptable in this rearward location and I do not regard the depth as being disproportionately large. Accordingly on the first issue, I do not consider that the proposed addition would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings in harmful conflict with Policies 6a & 37a
-

& b of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 ('the Local Plan') and Policy 7.6 of the London Plan as subsequently adapted / consolidated in the London Plan 2021.

6. On the second issue, the extension would be very close to the boundary with No. 8. Although the parapet wall / eaves would be a not unreasonable height of 2.8m / 2.7m and the roof would slope away, the rear elevation of No. 8 has full height and fully glazed patio doors which are the principal outlook to its rear garden.
7. As these glazed doors are very close to the boundary with No. 6, I see no basis for relaxing the Council's Residential Design Guidance SPG, which when applied to this proposal would require a gap of a metre to the fence line between the two properties. Without this, the outlook from No. 8 would be unduly compromised, even allowing for the fact that boundary fence would still result in some degree of enclosure for No.8. Furthermore, apart from being necessary for the reason explained, the 1m gap would enable hedge or shrub planting along No. 6's side of the boundary. This would have the potential to assist in screening the extension's flank wall and this could be conditioned as part of a permission.
8. On this issue I conclude that in its current form the appeal proposal would unacceptably affect the living conditions for No. 8 as regards outlook in conflict with Local Plan 37e; the aforementioned adapted / consolidated London Plan Policy 7.6, and paragraph 130f) of Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework 2021. I have noted a large number of other objections raised in a neighbour's representation letter but consider that subject to conditions on a permission as reasonably appropriate and necessary, these are of insufficient weight to preclude the proposed development.
9. For the above reasons I dismiss the appeal.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR