



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3353830

153 Hayes Chase, Bromley, West Wickham BR4 0JD

- 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 Mrs Roya Jafari against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/02215/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is described as: Erection of two storey side, two storey rear extension following of demolishing the existing garage and rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - character and appearance of the area; and
 - living conditions of the occupiers of 155 Hayes Chase, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property forms a two-storey semi-detached dwelling at the end of a cul-de-sac. The majority of the dwellings surrounding the appeal site form semi-detached pairs, many of which have undergone alterations in the form of side extensions but retain a symmetry in their design. Narrow gaps between neighbouring properties give the built environment a compact relationship.
4. The appeal dwelling has previously undergone a two-storey side extension, utilising a similar design to the host. This preserves its original character and the visual relationship with the adjoining dwelling, positively contributing to the character and appearance of the built environment.
5. The proposal would further extend the side elevation at two-storey level, widening the existing dwelling and degrading the congruity with the adjoining property. The proposed central two-storey projection to the front elevation is uncharacteristic of the pairs of semi-detached dwellings within the area. It would therefore appear an alien and unsympathetic addition to the street scene and further erode the visual connection with the adjoining property. Whilst 146 Hayes Chase has a two-storey central projection, it is a detached dwelling and not reflective of the overarching

character of the area. I therefore cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal that would weigh in its favour.

6. The proposed two-storey flat roofed rear extension is uncharacteristic of the appeal property and neighbouring dwellings, appearing an awkward addition to the host dwelling and its hipped roof form. Additionally, this two-storey rear extension increases the visual bulk of the existing modest side profile, further detracting from the appeal property's original form. Whilst views of the rear extension from the public realm would be limited, it would appear prominent when viewed from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties.
7. The proposed side extension would achieve a separation distance from the neighbouring site boundary of approximately 1 metre, complying with Policy 8a of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019) (Local Plan). This would preserve the visual break between dwellings and continue to reflect the close relationship of the surrounding dwellings. Nevertheless, this does not justify the above identified harm.
8. For these reasons, therefore, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area overall. Consequently, in this regard, it would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D3 of The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) (London Plan), and Policies 6 and 37 of the Local Plan. When read together these require new development to be of high-quality design, complementing the host dwelling, surrounding development, and street scene.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed rear extension would adjoin the shared boundary with No 155 Hayes Chase. No 155 has a large window within the first-floor rear elevation close to the boundary with the appeal site. The proposed two-storey rear extension would be set back closest to the boundary with No 155. This would limit its visual prominence when viewed from the first-floor rear window of No 155, maintaining an acceptable standard of outlook for its occupiers.
10. The Council have assessed the effect of the proposal on the outlook of the occupiers of surrounding properties. They have additionally assessed the effect of the proposal on neighbouring occupiers and surrounding properties with regard to privacy, levels of daylight or sunlight, and noise and dust from construction. On all counts, the Council have found the proposal to be acceptable. I see no reason to disagree with the Council in this regard.
11. For these reasons, therefore, the development would be acceptable with regard to its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 155 with regard to outlook. Consequently, in this regard, it would comply with the relevant provisions of Policy D3 of the London Plan and Policy 37 of the Local Plan. When read together these require new development to deliver appropriate outlook and respect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

12. The appellant submits that the proposal would resolve structural issues with the existing garage and side extension. Nevertheless, I see no reason why the proposal is necessary to facilitate this. I therefore afford this limited weight which

does not outweigh the above identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would be acceptable with regard to its effect on the living conditions of surrounding occupiers. Nonetheless, this is a neutral factor and would not outweigh the above identified harm to the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR