



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/24/3352574

1 Renton Drive, Bromley, Orpington BR5 4HH

- 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 Mr Paul Street against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref is 24/01353/FULL1.
 - The development proposed is described as: Construction of a new dwelling in the Side/Rear garden, with shared front access and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. The relevant design policies in the revised Framework are similar (other than paragraph references) to those in the previous Framework and as such I consider there would be no prejudice to any party by considering the development against the relevant parts in the revised Framework.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms a single storey detached dwelling on the corner of Renton Drive and Chelsfield Lane. The properties along this section of Renton Drive, including the appeal dwelling, share a similar building line set within generous plots. This creates a pleasing continuity in the relationship of the built environment to the highway, contributing to the character of the street scene.
5. The appeal site is in an elevated position in relation to Chelsfield Lane with the appeal property set back generously from the boundary with the highway creating a spaciousness to this part of the street scene. There is an existing garage located to the rear of the site, close to the boundary with Chelsfield Lane. The single storey flat roofed form of the garage limits its visibility from the street, maintaining the openness between the appeal dwelling and the highway.
6. The proposed single dwelling would comprise accommodation set over two floors with hipped style roof and dormers giving it a far greater visual presence than the

existing garage with the use of traditional materials providing little mitigation. The proposal would retain much of the vegetation and trees along the boundary with Chelsfield Lane and would include additional planting. Nonetheless, the elevated position of the appeal site and the proposal's proximity to the highway would give it a prominent and imposing appearance when viewed from Chelsfield Lane, harming the visual openness of the street scene.

7. The set back position of the proposal would disrupt the existing building line along Renton Drive. Further, the proposed dwelling would occupy the majority of its plot, appearing cramped in comparison to the spaciousness character of the surrounding built environment, particularly when viewed from Renton Drive.
8. Planning approval 19/02525/FULL1 was for a detached bungalow on land located on the opposite side of Chelsfield Lane. Its lower elevation restricts its prominence within the street scene. Moreover, its continuation of the existing building line and modest plot size allows the dwelling to better assimilate with the built character along this side of the highway. As such, I do not consider approval 19/02525/FULL1 to be comparable to the appeal before me.
9. For these reasons, therefore, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal would conflict with the relevant provisions of Policy D3 of The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (2021) (London Plan) and Policies 3, 4, and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (2019) (Local Plan). When read together, these policies require new development to enhance local context and respect local character.
10. The Council has referred to Policy D4 of the London Plan which primarily relates to mechanisms by which to secure design quality. It has not been explained how this is relevant to this main issue and so I consider it weighs neither in favour of nor against the appeal proposal.
11. The Council has additionally referred to Policy G7 of the London Plan and Policy 73 of the Local Plan which primarily relate to the protection of trees. The Council's appeal statement confirms that they are satisfied all or most of the trees within the appeal site would be retained and that this could be secured through a planning condition. As such, I find no conflict with these aforementioned policies.

Planning Balance

12. The evidence provided by the Council suggests that they have below a 3 year supply of deliverable housing sites. In these circumstances paragraph 11d) of the Framework is engaged. There is nothing before me to suggest that there are any policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance that provide a strong reason for refusing the development under paragraph 11d)(i).
13. Therefore, the balance in paragraph 11d(ii) applies such that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to specified key policies.
14. I have considered the various benefits put forward by the appellant that the proposal would bring arising from the scheme's design, the efficient and effective use of land on a small site within an accessible location and through contributing to the supply of housing in the area. The additional dwelling would make a positive,

albeit modest contribution to the supply of housing and the biodiversity net gain of approximately 11.2% would be minimal given the small scale of the appeal site. The Council have also found that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

15. While I have given these matters some weight in favour of the appeal, these modest benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. I have found above that taken overall the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to the design aims of the relevant development plan policies set out above.
16. The harm set out above would conflict with the environmental objective of sustainable development and, in my view, the adverse impacts would be sufficient to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the scheme's benefits when assessed against the Framework read as a whole. The proposal would not therefore amount to sustainable development in the terms of the Framework.

Conclusion

17. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR