
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2020

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/19/3240079

31 Scotts Lane, Shortlands, Bromley BR2 0LL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Edwards against the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref 19/02294/FULL1, is dated 28 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of the existing single storey side extension and detached garage and the construction of a 3 bedroom dwelling house with associated parking and landscaping.
-

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 is located on an exposed prominent corner plot where Scotts Lane meets Shortlands Grove. The site comprises land associated with the 2 storey semi detached property of No 31 Scotts Lane and includes a side extension of the main dwelling, garden land and a detached garage accessed off Shortlands Grove. The area is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings set back from the road within generous plots. Corner plots are generally open creating a spacious character.
4. The proposal may have a smaller footprint than a previously refused scheme and be located further away from the boundary with Shortlands Grove. Nevertheless, the scheme would lead to development that covers much of the width of the plot, even if the minimum space standards of Policy 8 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (Local Plan) were maintained.
5. The development would appear dominant and overbearing as a result of the height and overall massing of the property close to what otherwise is an open junction. Whilst there may be examples of similarly spaced properties in the vicinity, the proposal would be at odds with the general spacious characteristic of the area. It would consequently create an incongruous obtrusive addition to the street scene, the impact of which would be compounded by the prominent location of the development. The garden space on the very edge of the site

would do little to mitigate the harm given that it would be small in size. The design seeks to replicate elements of design features found elsewhere in the street scene. However, this would not obviate the harm identified.

6. Whilst the site is located in an area where infill housing development is supported in principle, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it would conflict with Policies 4, 8 and 37 of the Local Plan, the relevant parts of which require new development proposals to be of a high standard of design and layout and contribute positively to the existing street scene. The scheme would also conflict with the parts of Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan which seek to ensure the design of new development enhances the quality of places, having regard to amongst other things the physical context, local character, form and function of an area.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has identified a lack of harm from the scheme in terms of the impact on the highway network and the living conditions of future occupants and neighbouring properties. It has also been suggested that adequate provision for refuse and recycling would be made, that the development would meet floorspace standards and that the scheme would achieve a reduction in carbon emissions above those in the Building Regulations. Be that as it may, such matters would not outweigh or mitigate the harm the scheme would generate.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the scheme should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR