
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2017

by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCI Arb MCIL

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 24 February 2017

Appeal Reference: APP/G5180/D/16/3165989

74 Glanville Road, Bromley, Kent BR2 9LW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss J Dillon against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley Council.
 - The application (reference DC/16/02987/FULL1, dated 17 July 2016) was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the creation of a hardstanding and vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue to be determined in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. Glanville Road is a pleasant residential location, set with buildings in conventional domestic styles, set back behind small front gardens. Many of the front gardens have been adapted to allow some off-street parking, which has introduced a hard landscaped appearance in some sections of the road frontages, though there is also scope for some planting in front gardens that softens the streetscene. In addition, the pedestrian footpaths each side of the carriageway are set with irregularly spaced trees, along the road.
4. The front garden at number 74 Glanville Road includes some planting and there is a holly tree at the front of the adjoining property. There is a significant tree in the pedestrian footpath immediately opposite the front garden at number 74, which makes an important contribution to the streetscene.
5. The proposal that is the subject of this appeal would involve the creation of a parking bay within the front garden at number 74, with a new crossover to the carriageway.
6. Among other things, the 'National Planning Policy Framework' emphasises the aim of "requiring good design" in the broadest sense (notably at Section 7) and it points out the importance of creating an attractive streetscape and maintaining the overall quality of the area.

7. An emphasis on the importance of good design is also to be found in the Development Plan and Policy NE7 of the 'London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan' draws particular attention to the visual importance of trees in the townscape of the Borough.
8. The tree adjacent to the frontage of 74 Glanville Road is important to the character of the surroundings and its loss would be harmful to the appearance of the street, unacceptably eroding its attractiveness.
9. In this case, the submitted drawing showing the proposed parking bay lacks precision (and is not to scale) and, consequently, the impact of the proposed works on the tree in the footpath is uncertain. The submitted drawing shows a crossover that would clearly affect the tree, although there could be space for a parking bay at one side of the front garden that would not be directly obstructed by the tree but which would appear to affect existing services. In any case, a new crossover would certainly have some effect on the tree's root system.
10. In the absence of a carefully detailed scheme to show how the tree could be retained (if, indeed, that is possible), it must be concluded that the proposed new hardstanding and vehicular access would result in the loss of the tree. Such a loss would cause great harm to the streetscene that would clearly outweigh the benefits of the scheme. Hence, the scheme would be contrary to both national and local policies, including Policy NE7 of the 'London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan', and it would be unacceptable in planning terms.
11. In reaching these conclusions I have considered whether the appeal could be allowed but subject to conditions that might overcome the concerns that I have identified. In view of all the uncertainties involved, however, I have formed the opinion that it would not be possible to frame precise conditions to deal with the objections that I have identified and that therefore the appeal must be dismissed. Although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.

Roger C Shrimplin

INSPECTOR