



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2023 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3325498

4 Glebe House Drive, Hayes, Bromley BR2 7BN

- 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 & Mrs Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref. DC/23/01221/FULL6, dated 27 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 23 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a side and rear two storey extension with additional loft accommodation and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 2 Glebe House Drive with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling adjoins No. 2, a two-storey property of a similar scale. There is a window and glazed double doors within the ground floor rear elevation of No. 2, in addition to two windows in the first floor. The rear garden is narrow and elongated. The widest point adjoins the dwelling, tapering further to the rear with mature vegetation creating a distinct sense of enclosure. The rear elevation of No. 2 has not been extended, sharing a building line with the main body of the appeal property.
5. The proposed rear extension would project significantly from the host dwelling. The single-storey element would protrude noticeably above the existing boundary treatment, particularly at the point nearest to the rear of the dwelling. When combined with its close proximity to the boundary with No. 2, it would create a large expanse of unbroken wall along the shared boundary. The proposal would exacerbate the existing narrow and enclosed nature of the rear garden, appearing prominent and overbearing when viewed from the rear glazed doors, the ground floor window of No. 2 and the area of garden closest to them.

6. The two-storey section of the proposed rear extension would be set back from the shared boundary. When combined with its lower eaves and ridge height to that of the host dwelling, its mass would be minimised when viewed from the rear windows and garden area of No. 2, preventing any overbearing impact from this element. The proposal would additionally involve a large dormer within the rear roof slope. The Council has raised no objections to this element and there are no compelling reasons for me to take an alternative view.
7. Be this as it may, and for the above reasons, the proposed development when taken as a whole would have an unacceptable impact on the outlook of the occupiers of No. 2 Glebe House Drive. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 which broadly require new development to be compatible with surrounding development and respect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

8. The lack of objection from neighbouring occupiers does not in itself justify allowing the proposal, which would be otherwise harmful as I have explained. The alleged lack of a visit from the Council's officers prior to the determination of the planning application is a procedural matter which is not within the remit of this appeal to address.
9. The proposal's extension beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling would be notably greater than that of the examples provided, resulting in an increased visual prominence and unacceptable effect on outlook. Furthermore, and in the case of appeal APP/G5180/D/16/3142033 specifically, the adjoining dwelling benefited from an existing rear extension, reducing the extent of development projecting beyond its rear building line. As such, these examples are analogous to the appeal proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR