



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2024 by N Unwin BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 JUNE 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/23/3328889

30 Harwood Avenue, Bromley BR1 3DU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Anahit Zakaryan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is DC/23/00554/FULL1.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of existing 4-bed dwelling house and construction of a new 4-bed dwelling house with loft accommodation'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property forms a detached two storey dwelling on the corner of Harwood Avenue and St Blaise Avenue. The area is primarily characterised by semi-detached two-storey dwellings with hipped roofs set back from the highway by modest front gardens cultivating a spacious street scene. Many of the rear elevations have been altered and extended, resulting in a varied character. Nevertheless, these are subservient and proportionate to the host dwellings, with the use of similar architectural features facilitating a visual link to their respective host property.
5. The dwellings with side elevations facing the highway, including that of the appeal property, are mostly set back from the public realm by single storey projections with the side elevation of these dwellings possessing a narrow profile. The narrow profiles and set back nature of side elevations visually reduce their mass when viewed from the street scene and contribute to the existing spacious character of the highway. As a result, the existing dwelling makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposed two storey side elevation would be close to the boundary with St Blaise Avenue, with a wide elevation, increasing its visual prominence from this

viewpoint. Due to its proximity and scale the proposed dwelling would narrow the current sense of spaciousness around the corner plot. The proposal would increase the built form of development on site, projecting significantly into the rear garden and creating a substantial and imposing form of development.

7. Moreover, the proposal includes window features and dormers that are of various styles and forms. These features create an erratic design absent of harmonious form. The side elevation would be bereft of adequate architectural interest, with a large blank elevation on a single plane, harbouring limited active window openings. Furthermore, the rear dormer would be a bulky feature which would not share any commonality of design with the rest of the dwelling. It is also apparent that the window and garage door below would not align, creating a misalignment of features. The architectural mismatch of components and overall mass of form would result in the proposal appearing visually dominant, and oppressive when viewed from St Blaise Avenue and when approaching from Harwood Avenue, harming the existing pleasant open character and appearance of the street scene.
8. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would thus, in regard to this main issue, conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies 4, 8, and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019), and the Bromley Supplementary Planning Guidance Numbers 1 and 2. These policies, when read together, require new development to respect local character and positively contribute to the existing street scene.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR