



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2017

by A A Phillips BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/17/3179414
2 Thirlmere Rise, Bromley BR1 4HY

- 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 Griffin Property Developments against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01479/FULL1, dated 29 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a linked 3 storey town house with associated parking, amenity space, bin and cycle storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises part of the side garden of No 2 Thirlmere Rise and is directly adjacent to the flank wall of that property. The site is currently part of the side garden enclosed by a close wooden boarded fence and is partly occupied by a wooden shed. The site is adjacent to the junction of Thirlmere Rise and Kings Avenue and backs on to Bromley Hill, but is separated from the main highway to the rear by a garden and a wide grass verge with mature landscaping.
4. Thirlmere Drive is comprised of staggered terraces of three storey town houses which have integral ground floor garages. Nearby properties along Kings Avenue are of similar character but have different design characteristics.
5. The current proposal is for a three storey town house which would be linked to No 2 Thirlmere Rise. It has been designed to complement the adjacent property and the wider terrace and would be set in from the boundary with the adjacent highway, Kings Avenue.
6. No 2 Thirlmere Rise is situated at the end of a terraced row of town houses and, along with the frontage of the terrace formed by the town houses on the opposite side of Kings Road form a relatively open and spacious entrance to the residential area from Bromley Hill. Although there is little consistency in the spaces at the end of the terraces and the gaps between groups of properties one important defining feature of the area are the relatively open areas around

street corners and junctions. The space to the side of No 2 along with the nearby landscaped grass verges and mature street tree forms a visually important break between the relatively dense built form of Thirlmere Rise and the area around the junction of Kings Avenue and Bromley Hill.

7. The proposed development would disrupt the open character of this part of the residential area, introducing built form in a space which is significant and valuable in the street scene. It would result in a conspicuous development and create a more cramped and awkward relationship between built form and the public realm and detract from the spatial standards and high quality visual amenity which characterises this particular area and other residential areas in the wider residential context of the Borough.
8. I consider that the spaces around the residential blocks in this particular area are essential to ensuring a high quality form of development. Consequently, although the frontage of the site and the extent of the rear garden would be consistent with adjacent properties the proposal would represent poor design which would have a harmful effect on the established distinctive pattern of development and would fail to complement the established pattern of development. The existing dwelling at No 2 Thirlmere Rise projects forward of the building line formed by properties along Kings Avenue, but nonetheless the current proposal would represent unacceptable and harmful development forward of the building line which would encroach into an important open area and would fail to respect the existing residential layout.
9. I acknowledge that the overall scale and design of the proposal would be consistent with adjacent properties and that some of the Council's adopted layout standards are adhered to, I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with Policies 3.4, 3.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policies BE1, H1, H7 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan July 2006 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Among other objectives these seek to ensure that new housing developments are of a high quality design which makes a positive contribution to a coherent public realm and buildings should be appropriate to their settings, having regard to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account other matters raised I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alastair Phillips

INSPECTOR