
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/16/3165262

28 Grosvenor Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1QU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Aventier Landbank against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/03675/OUT, dated 3 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 4-bedroom semi-detached dwellings with associated access and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application is made in outline with details of access, layout and scale subject to consideration as part of this proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

Reasons

4. Grosvenor Road, which forms part of the ASRC, is characterised by large dwellings set back in spacious and verdant plots. The appeal site is one of four properties, the other three being No 30 Grosvenor Road and Nos 17 and 19 Sutherland Avenue, which are in a corner location siding onto Elysian Avenue. These dwellings have a similar L-shaped design with shallow projecting central sections which give the buildings a splayed form and contribute to the open character of the surroundings. Though varying in terms of proximity to the street, in their corner locations the splayed design of the dwellings create open vistas of adjoining tree-lined streets and a perception of spaciousness and symmetry around the turn in the road. This also helps to define the sense of entrance to the street and is a key characteristic of this location.
 5. The proposed semi-detached dwellings would be marginally shorter compared to the overall height of the adjacent dwelling at No 26. In addition, set within a very spacious plot, the development would be sufficiently separated from the
-

side boundaries to avoid appearing cramped. Furthermore, indicative drawings show that the design of the dwellings could incorporate forward projecting gable features which are evident in the wider street scene. However, notwithstanding this, the scale of the proposed building would be significantly bulkier than that of the existing dwelling and, with its rectangular form, would disrupt and unbalance the aforementioned sense of space and symmetry around the turn in the street. It would encroach on the high standard of separation to the side boundary resulting from the existing L-shaped dwelling. The proposal would thus fail to protect a well-defined, cohesive and visually attractive element in the pattern of development in the locality.

6. Whilst there is no dispute between the parties that the increase in density of residential development on the site would be below maximum guidelines and irrespective of the amount of floorspace provided, the proposal would, nevertheless, be unsatisfactory in terms of its impact on local context and character.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the ASRC. It would therefore conflict with Policies 3.4, 3.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015; Policies BE1, H1, H7, H9 and H10 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as they seek to secure a high standard of design that protects the quality of the street scene, including standards of side space, and respects and complements the established qualities of the ASRC.
8. The proposal would result in the provision of an additional dwelling with an associated positive effect in terms of the local economy. However, these benefits would be very limited due to the small scale of development involved. Even if the Council were unable to demonstrate a five year housing land supply (the position of the appellant, which is contested by the Council) I am firmly of the view that the adverse design impacts of the scheme would significantly and demonstrably outweigh these benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole. Accordingly, the proposal in this case does not amount to sustainable development and the presumption in favour of such, as set out in the Framework, does not apply.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR