



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2024 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3345881

420 Southborough Lane, Bromley BR2 8BH

- 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 & Mrs Agrawal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/01056/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as 'part single/part two storey rear extension, two storey side extension and loft conversion'.
-

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 Matters and Main Issues

3. The description above is taken from the application form and whilst it varies slightly from the decision notice, the difference is not fundamental. The ability of any party to make their case in respect of the appeal scheme would not be prejudiced by me referring to it these terms.
4. The Council do not object to the alterations to the rear of the property. I have no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focuses on the two-storey side extension and specifically its effect on a) the living conditions of the occupiers of number 422 Southborough Lane (No 422) with specific regard to outlook and b) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Living Conditions

5. The appeal building is a semi-detached dwelling that sits closely alongside another pair of semi-detached units. The extension would be towards No 422 and abutting the boundary. The second storey would be stepped in to create a small gap between the boundary and the extended part.
6. No 422 has a second storey that extends slightly over the ground floor on the elevation closest to the appeal building. The entrance door to No 422 is on the side elevation. Combining the projection of the neighbouring first floor with the proximity of the proposed extension to the side, it would be overbearing to the

occupants of No 422 when they would be accessing their property by creating a boxing in effect around the door. The overbearing nature of the extension would also be experienced from the windows of the side elevation of No 422 creating a further unacceptable reduction to the quality of the outlook, where the existing arrangement is already very close with limited views.

7. The proposed development would therefore cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of No 422. This would be contrary to Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (LP) which are concerned with protecting residential amenity amongst other things.

Character and Appearance

8. The appeal site is situated within a residential area where pairs of semi-detached properties are, on the whole, regularly spaced and set back from the roadside creating a pleasant sense of spaciousness that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
9. There are plenty of other properties on Southborough Lane that have been extended in varying ways. However, most are still separated by relatively even substantial gaps, particularly at first floor level. The proposed development would extend into the existing gap between it and the non adjoined neighbour and erode the open feel that is currently experienced. The second storey would be stepped in from the ground floor, but this will not sufficiently alleviate the harm from its bulkiness.
10. The proposed development will therefore create a cramped effect that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the LP which are concerned with respecting space between buildings that contribute to an area's character and appearance amongst other things.

Other Matter

11. The other examples of extensions cited locally have not led me to recommend allowing the appeal for the reasons outlined above. Such tend to be an exception rather than the norm for the area in any event.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR