
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3232332

44 Kinnaird Avenue, Bromley BR1 4HQ

- 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 Agnieszka Zala against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/01200/FULL6, dated 12 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is side, rear and roof extension to detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling occupying a prominent corner position. Notwithstanding the appellant's criticism of the build's materials and design, it nevertheless has a distinctive appearance, with cube like proportions and a pyramid roof inset behind a raised parapet. This size and design of dwelling is repeated along Kinnaird Close.
4. Although the dwelling at the appeal site is set back, with its access from Kinnaird Avenue, it was built at the same time as Kinnaird Close and is of an identical design. The majority of the dwellings on Kinnaird Close, including the appeal site, retain many original features and have not been subject to any significant alteration or extension. The appeal site clearly appears as being part of that development, and together they form a distinctive group that makes a positive contribution to the character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, due to its corner position it is also very prominent from the surrounding area, particularly from Park Avenue, and acts as a visual 'gateway' into the Kinnaird Close development.
5. The appeal scheme proposes substantial extensions to the existing dwelling, significantly increasing its overall bulk and proportions. The extensions would completely envelope the existing building leaving little reference to its original scale or design.

6. The height of the dwelling would also be increased, and the proposed mansard roof would add substantial bulk to the overall appearance of the dwelling and increase its prominence when viewed from the street. The development would therefore not respond positively to the size and design of the existing dwelling.
7. The large, almost full height glazed windows and mansard roof would also not be characteristic of the adjacent development or surrounding area. The proposed materials would not reflect the existing building and would contrast harmfully with the existing properties on Kinnaird Close.
8. Although there are examples of render and timber cladding to the development on Kinnaird Avenue, the traditional form and scale of those dwellings is still very apparent. The size and design of the extended dwelling would be at odds with this established character and it would jar visually, appearing as an incongruous addition within the streetscene.
9. Whilst considered in isolation the proposal may result in a modern, contemporary dwelling of a size which could be accommodated in this large plot, it would not respond well to its setting or context and would completely obscure any hint of the form or design of the host dwelling. It is however noted that the detached garage, due to its height and design, would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area.
10. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan, 2019, which seek to ensure that developments are of a high-standard of design, contribute positively to the existing streetscene and are of a scale, form and materials which respect or complement those of the host dwelling and are compatible with development in the surrounding area. In addition, the proposals would not achieve the high-quality design requirement of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. I have taken into account the energy efficiencies the appellant proposes to include in the scheme; however, I do not consider these benefits would be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Other Matters

12. It is acknowledged that the proposals would raise no concerns in relation to parking provision or impact on protected trees, though I consider these would have a neutral effect and therefore do not weigh in favour of the appeal.
13. Whilst the appellant has attempted to address the Council's objections to a previous scheme on the site, having considered the proposal on its own merits, this does not alter the harmful effects I have found. These other matters, therefore, do not lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons stated above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR