



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2024 by R Parker BSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 OCTOBER 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3339621

14 Borkwood Park, Bromley, Orpington BR6 9LD

- 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 Srijith Prabhu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/23/04562/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is ground floor front, side and rear extensions and new crossover to serve new parking space.
-

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

3. The appeal dwelling and its neighbours are built to a relatively unusual design with the rear elevation facing the street. The appellant's Grounds of Appeal refer to this elevation as the front, as that is how the property is used. However, for the purposes of this recommendation, the references to the front and back of the property will reflect the information shown on the drawings considered by the Council for the determination of the planning application subject to this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is in a suburban residential area characterised by dwellings built in groups of a cohesive design, providing a pleasant rhythm to the street scene. It is part of a group of an unusual design, partly defined by a staggered building line. Properties in the group have modest front and back gardens, which nevertheless contribute to the area's suburban character.
6. The footprint of the existing dwelling would be considerably extended, and with the porch, front, and rear extensions, the cumulative depth of the dwelling and the proposed additions would be significantly greater than other dwellings in the immediate area. The excessive size and bulk of the combined front and

rear extensions proposed would appear incongruous and disproportionate to the scale, proportions, as well as the form of the host property, and cause harm to the surrounding area. The siting of these extensions in already modest garden space would unduly stand out as inappropriate and overly dominant additions, severely truncating the usable outdoor space of current and future occupants but also eroding the area's character.

7. The surfeit of scale would arise principally because of the depth and width of the additions relative to the size of the existing house. Moreover, the proposed extensions would harmfully interrupt the staggered appearance of the dwellings which is a defining characteristic of the area. While the proposed front extension would not be highly prominent from the street, it would nevertheless remain visible in public views from the existing path providing pedestrian access to the appeal and neighbouring properties. Here, again, the disproportionate scale of the proposed addition and its disturbance of the staggered building line would detract from the established pattern of development to a harmful degree.
8. The rear, street-facing, elevations of other dwellings in this group have been extended. I observed these during the site visit but have not been presented with full details of the individual cases for comparison to the appeal scheme, and visibility within the street scene was limited by high boundary treatments. Nonetheless, to the degree that I was able to observe them, these extensions did not appear to detract from the staggered pattern of the group due to their modest scale.
9. It has been put to me that the immediate area contains a wide variety of properties of differing heights, roof profiles, and scales. I disagree; the area includes properties of varying styles, but all are built in distinct groups of the same design. The garages belonging to 14 Borkwood Park and its neighbours have a cohesive appearance, built in pairs to a repeated pattern which contributes to the rhythm characterising the street scene. Therefore, in my view, the presence of the garages reinforces the duplicated appearance of the dwellings which consequently present very clearly as a group, and the established pattern of development in the locality.
10. The appellant has submitted that the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) allows single storey extensions of up to 8.0m on detached homes. However, this would have to be subject to the completion of the prior approval process. I have been presented with no detailed evidence that a prior approval application for a larger home extension has been considered by the Council, and so cannot be certain that there is a true fallback position in this instance. Accordingly, I have ascribed this consideration very limited weight. The appellant has also mentioned the use of a suitable palette of matching materials. However, this does not overcome my concerns regarding the harm which would be caused by the proposed extensions.
11. The proposal would fail to complement and cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property or surrounding area, due to the excessive size and bulk of the extensions. As a result, it would conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan. These notably require residential extensions to respect or complement the scale, form, and materials of the host

dwelling, surrounding area, and adjacent buildings, and the proportions of the latter.

Other Matters

12. Neighbouring residents have raised concerns about the effect this proposal would have on their living conditions. However, in view of my recommendation to dismiss the appeal on other grounds, I have not considered this matter further.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Parker

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Edwards

INSPECTOR