
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/25/3361723

11 Alexandra Road, Biggin Hill TN16 3NY

- 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 Allan Broadhurst against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/03669/FULL1.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension over existing double garage and lounge, and conversion into two-bedroom self-build dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application form states that the proposal is for a self-build dwelling, although this is not mentioned in the description of development on the form. On the submitted self-build proforma, the appellant has acknowledged that the description of development could be amended to say that it is for a self-build dwelling. I have therefore taken the description of development from the Decision Notice and appeal form, which more accurately describes the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is on a prominent corner plot and consists of an attached garage and part of the garden area of the existing bungalow. It is in a residential area which has a mix of house types and sizes with a range of designs, roof forms and materials. The garage has a similar design and gable roof form to the main dwelling which, together with its limited height, ensures that it is subservient to the bungalow. Overall, the bungalow and garage have a pleasing consistency that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the street.
5. The ridge height would be lower than that of the previously refused planning application¹, and the proposed dwelling would be slightly lower in height to the bungalow. Although the new dwelling would have a gable roof, the proposed side dormers would be built up to the ridge line, resulting in a considerable flat roof

¹ Planning application ref. 23/04251/FULL1

appearance. The dormers would also introduce significant bulk and massing at the roof level which would not be in keeping with the adjacent bungalows.

6. For these reasons, the sub-division of the plot, together with the design, bulk and position of the proposal would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the area. It would have a visually awkward and cramped appearance within the street scene, which would be further emphasised by the prominent corner location.
7. The 'catslide' roof of the previously approved side extension² would be considerably lower than the roof height of the proposed dwelling. Consequently, the side extension would have had significantly less of an impact on the street scene and as such does not justify the appeal proposal.
8. Three terraced and two semi-detached houses were allowed on appeal at 21 Alexandra Road³. However, No 21 is not on a corner plot and is therefore not as prominent in the street scene as the appeal site. In any event, this appeal has been determined on its own merits.
9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the bulky and cramped appearance of the proposed dwelling would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 3, 4, 8 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Planning Division Local Plan (2019) (BLP) and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) (LP). These policies require, amongst other things, for development to be of a high standard of design which respects local character and physical context, complements the scale, form and layout of adjacent buildings and areas, and to maintain an appropriate space to the side of the building.

Other Matters

10. The proposal is for a self-build dwelling. However, notwithstanding the self-build proforma I have no mechanism, such as a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), before me to secure the new dwelling as a self-build property. As such, I am unable to conclude that the proposal would meet the self-build exemption to the general biodiversity gain condition. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds, I do not need to consider this matter further.
11. The Council does not raise any objections with regards to the living conditions of neighbours and future occupiers of the dwelling, garden space, highways or drainage. Based on the evidence before me I have no reason to disagree. However, a lack of harm in these regards is a neutral factor and does not alter my conclusion of harm.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. The Council's current published five-year housing land supply is a 3.36-year supply of housing sites, whilst a recent appeal decision⁴ concluded that the Council could demonstrate only a 2.4-year supply. The Council has not disputed this position. This is well below the minimum level required and with reference to

² Planning application ref. 14/02264/FULL6

³ Planning appeal ref. APP/G5180/W/21/3285323

⁴ Planning appeal ref. APP/G5180/W/24/3340223

paragraph 11 d) of the Framework, consideration of the presumption in favour of sustainable development is needed.

13. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would, therefore, conflict with BLP policies 3, 4, 8 and 37 and LP Policies D3 and D4 in this regard.
14. The provision of one additional unit would make a small contribution to the existing supply. Economic advantages would also arise from the construction and occupation of a new house, although these would be limited by the scale of the scheme. The proposal would also provide a self-build dwelling, although there is no mechanism before me to secure the dwelling as self-build. For these reasons, these benefits would be limited.
15. I have considered the policies in the development plan referenced by the parties. The proposal would conflict with BLP policies 3, 4, 8 and 37 and LP Policies D3 and D4. I am satisfied that these conflicts mean that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. These policies are generally consistent with the Framework and so these conflicts carry substantial weight.
16. The proposal would not conflict with the Framework's policies that protect areas or assets of particular importance and therefore paragraph 11d)i) of the Framework does not apply in this case.
17. However, 11d)ii) should be applied. This requires planning permission to be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land including through the use of previously-developed land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
18. The proposed development would be supported by parts of the Framework, including policies to increase housing supply. The proposal would contribute towards the provision of self-build housing and would also support economic growth.
19. However, there would also be conflict with parts of the Framework, including policies to achieve well-designed places and to make effective use of land. Furthermore, no affordable housing is proposed.
20. In my view, the adverse impacts of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development with regard to paragraph 11 d ii) of the Framework.
21. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that would cause me to determine this appeal otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR