



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 JULY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/25/3366508

8 Queensway, West Wickham, Bromley BR4 9ER

- 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 Chris Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref is 25/00377/FULL6.
 - The development proposed is planning permission for an air source heat pump.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development set out above is taken from the application form rather than from the Council's unilaterally altered description as listed on its decision notice. I have made one alteration, omitting reference to 'retrospective' as referred to on the application form because retrospective does not constitute an act of development. While the heat pump is in situ, I have considered it on its own merits.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring properties with specific regard to outlook and visual amenity.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with a white render finish, driveway parking and an open frontage onto the street scene. The property is within a residential area of dwellings of a similar design, scale, layout and materials which gives the street scene a relatively uniform character and appearance.
5. The proposal is located forward of the ground floor lean to front window on the host dwelling within the open front garden area. It is tall enough to partially block the window and highly visible from the street scene and neighbouring properties due to the lack of screening to the front and sides of the property frontage. The

proposal has an industrial appearance which does not complement the materials on the existing dwelling and dominates the open frontage of the property. It is an incongruous feature, out of character with the residential dwelling that does not positively contribute to the street scene.

6. In conclusion, the proposal has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. It conflicts with Policies 6 and 37 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019 (BLP) insofar as they seek to ensure the scale, form and materials of construction of new residential development should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and the surrounding area and positively contribute to the existing street scene.

Living conditions

7. The proposal is located close to the shared boundary with the neighbour (10 Queensway) and given the lack of screening between the properties, is highly visible from the front garden and driveway of this property. The proposal is also visible from the attached neighbour at No 6 Queensway and to those opposite the development. However, due to the scale of the proposal, I do not consider there is an overbearing impact on neighbouring properties or a significant detrimental impact upon the visual amenities of the neighbouring properties that would be sufficient to warrant a refusal on those grounds.
8. In conclusion, the proposal has an acceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring properties with regard to outlook and visual amenity. The proposal would comply with Policy 37 of the BLP insofar as it would respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings ensuring they would not be harmed by noise and disturbance, inadequate daylight, sunlight, privacy or overshadowing.
9. Policy 6 of the BLP was also referred to in the decision notice, however, this policy relates to the effect of the proposal on character of the area and not the amenity of neighbouring properties. I do not consider this policy relevant to the matter in dispute and therefore was not determinative in this matter.

Other Matters

10. I note from the appellant's statement that they were unaware planning permission was required for the proposal and that the appellant is seeking advice on visual improvements to the proposal, its potential relocation or alterations to its size. However, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the plans before me. The merits of an alternative scheme would, if necessary, be a matter for the main parties to consider as part of a fresh proposal away from this appeal.
11. The appellant refers to other properties in the area with heat pumps of a similar size and in a similar position to the proposal. I have not been provided with details of these properties and so cannot make a direct comparison, and in any event, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. I conclude the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene contrary to Policies 6 and 37 of the BLP. This amounts to conflict with the development plan as a whole.

13. I note the personal circumstances of the appellant with respect to the funding of the proposal, the potential repercussions for heating the property and also the comments regarding relations with a neighbour. However, whilst I have given these matters careful consideration, I am mindful of the advice contained in Planning Practice Guidance that in general planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. I therefore find that these factors are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused contrary to the development plan.
14. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR