



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2024 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3344919

17 Partridge Drive, Orpington BR6 8PF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Olukunle Odunfa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/00811/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed demolish existing conservatory and erection of rear part single and double storey extension. Garage conversion and front elevation alterations.'
-

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.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. The Council's reason for refusal refers to the proposed two storey extension, implying that they do not object to the scheme's other elements. I have no reason to disagree and my recommendation focusses on the same, specifically its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 16 Partridge Drive with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property sits close No 16 Partridge Drive with only a small distance between each side elevation. The buildings are large but have short rear gardens. The extension would stretch along half of No 16's side boundary. Whilst satisfying a 45 degree line from its rear windows, this projection would exist very close to and somewhat loom over the garden space to its immediate rear. The end boundary to No 16's garden is heavily landscaped with mature trees. This and the relatively small size of the garden would exacerbate the hemmed in feel exuded by the extension. The projection, proximity and height of the extension would, for these reasons, detrimentally affect the outlook from the rear garden of No 16. This would create an unacceptably poor standard of living conditions for its occupiers.
5. The two-storey aspect of the proposal would not extend out as far as the single storey section. This would however be by a negligible amount and insufficient to acceptably reduce the harm it would cause as a whole. As a consequence, it

would conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) which seeks to ensure amongst other things, that the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings is protected.

Other Matters

6. The appellant has raised concern that the measurements referred to in the Council's officer report are incorrect. I have however taken into account the submitted plans and what I observed on site which was sufficient for me to form a view and come to the above conclusions. The garden that would remain for the appeal building would be more than sufficient in size terms for the occupiers thereof albeit I note this was not a contentious matter in the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

7. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate departing therefrom. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR