

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 15/03982/FULL1

Ward:
Bromley Town

Address : 7 Beckenham Lane Bromley BR2 0DA

OS Grid Ref: E: 539798 N: 169404

Applicant : Mr M Hartley

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing building and construction of replacement two storey building with additional accommodation within roof space comprising 9 residential flats (7x2 bedroom and 2x3 bedroom), bin store, cycle store, 13 car parking spaces, alterations to existing vehicular/pedestrian access onto Beckenham Lane, front boundary and associated landscaping at Nos 7-9 Beckenham Lane

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Bromley Town Centre
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Bromley Town Centre Area Buffer 200m
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds
London Distributor Roads
Smoke Control SCA 3
Urban Open Space

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing building and construction of a replacement two storey building with additional accommodation within roof space comprising 9 residential flats (7x2 bedroom and 2x3 bedroom), bin store, cycle store, 13 car parking spaces, alterations to existing vehicular/pedestrian access onto Beckenham Lane, front boundary and associated landscaping at Nos 7-9 Beckenham Lane

The proposed building would follow roughly the same front building line as the existing pair of semi-detached properties and would have a width of 20.2m at its maximum extents. To the rear the building would project further back than the existing with a staggered rear building line fluctuating between 9.65m and 16m. The building has an eaves height of 6.25m and ridge height of 9.02m and will be set below the road level at ground floor. A distance of approximately 1.9m minimum side space would be retained to the eastern flank boundary of the site increasing to 3.5m on upper floors and approximately 3.3m minimum side space would be retained to the western flank boundary of the site. Balconies and Juliet

balconies are proposed at the rear first and second floor levels. A large communal landscaped garden is provided to the rear curtilage.

Materials are indicated as red clay brickwork above a black stone plinth with a natural slate roof finish and GRP lead finish to flat roof areas. Windows and doors to be powder coated aluminium frames.

The front curtilage will be hard landscaped for 13 parking spaces with some soft areas of planting to the peripheral areas. A bin store will be located adjacent to eastern boundary with Glebe Knoll. A single vehicle access utilising the existing western side access onto Beckenham Lane is proposed.

Location

The site is located on the south side of Beckenham Lane and currently comprises a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings, one of which has been extended at its first floor side.

The application site falls within the Bromley Town Centre Conservation Area. Pixfield Court, to the west of the application site is a statutory listed building (Grade II) divided into flats. Glebe Knoll, to the east is a locally listed building with a new flatted development in its grounds.

Beckenham Lane slopes upwards from west to east putting the application site at a higher level than Pixfield Court. The surrounding area contains mainly residential development and a primary school.

The current building on the application site is situated prominently further forward than Pixfield Court and Glebe Knoll. Beyond Pixfield Court is a modern terrace of houses. The site includes extensive external amenity space at the rear which is mainly laid to lawn and densely overgrown in some places with a considerable number of trees mostly located around the perimeter of the site. There are two existing vehicular accesses from Beckenham Lane.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- o Poor siting of existing building and consequent replacement of greater mass will have seriously negative impact on setting of three heritage assets - Grade II Listed Pixfield Court, Locally Listed Glebe Knoll and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- o In appropriate to be built between two historic buildings.
- o Concerns regarding the effect by increased traffic on a dangerous and busy section of Beckenham Lane.
- o Building more homes at this location will increase congestion.
- o Too large, unattractive and does not contribute positively to the area and inappropriate in a conservation area.
- o Size and angle of development is unacceptable.

- o Another block of flats will have a negative impact on the area.
- o Still feel the building is too big for the plot.
- o Adjacent property will be overlooked by the flats with loss of privacy.
- o Two story building with three storeys of living space is misleading.
- o Overdevelopment.
- o Situated between 2 listed buildings in a conservation area.
- o Setting of listed buildings should be protected.
- o Bulky, unattractive and dominant design.
- o Concerns regarding invasive and long period of construction.
- o Negative impact on outlook, privacy and natural light.
- o Footprint of the building is closer to the boundary of Pixfield Court at upper levels.
- o Trees on boundary with Pixfield Court should be retained.
- o 13 car park spaces is not enough and will cause further congestion and parking issues in both Pixfield Court and Beckenham Lane.
- o Proposal will overshadow and reduce lighting and sun light to Pixfield Court
- o Proximity of new block is way too close to adjacent properties and extended much closer than existing building.
- o Too many character buildings demolished for inferior rebuilds.
- o Anything larger than the existing building will have a negative effect on the historical setting of adjacent buildings.

A petition against the development containing approximately 110 signatures was also received.

Consultees

Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas:

Objection. The existing property is poorly sited in relation to the neighbouring listed buildings and any replacement should not exceed the volume of the existing building in any direction.

Heritage and Urban Design:

An application refused under 04/04718/FULL1 sought to demolish and replace this building, this decision was appealed. The two main findings of the Inspector were that the existing building could be demolished as it made a neutral contribution to the area but that it itself is harmful to the setting of adjacent listed building Pixfield Court and locally listed building Glebe Knoll, primarily because it sits well in advance of both of these buildings. The Inspector goes on to say that any larger building would only increase this harm. A larger building would affect to some degree views of, and from, the listed buildings.

I see no real reason why this assessment would now be seen differently and in fact it is likely that the setting of heritage assets has increased significance under the NPPF , for example para 129 and 132. I appreciate the applicant has significantly reduced the scale of the structure but it nonetheless conflicts with the inspectors view.

I would conclude therefore that harm would be caused to the setting of both Pixfield Court and Glebe Knoll, and therefore also to this part of the CA. This harm would be caused by the increase in volume over the existing house and I would see this harm as "less than substantial" as per the NPPF. Therefore para 134 would require a public benefit to outweigh this harm but I do not see that this would be provided other than the provision of further housing which would be modest in real terms. Therefore I feel this proposal should be resisted.

Technical Highways:

The applicant had submitted a Road Safety Audit Stage 1 with the previous application 14/02967, which was considered satisfactory and still holds good for this application. The applicant has kept the same number of units but reduced the sizes so there are 7 x 2 bedroom and 2 x 3 bedroom units which is better.

Drainage:

Details of a surface water drainage scheme are required. A condition is suggested in this regard.

Environmental Health - Housing:

In summary some flats are below recommended size for bedrooms; combined living and kitchen space is not desirable due to risk of accidents; lack of reasonable outlook from some rooms; lack of adequate natural ventilation

Environmental Health - Pollution:

No objections in principle.

Bromley Town Centre Team:

The development proposed is situated just outside the periphery of the town centre boundary, its location and scale will not to have a significant impact on AAP current policies. The Town Centre Development team therefore, have no objections to this scheme.

Crime Prevention Design Officer:

No concerns raised. Project should be able to achieve Secure by Design requirements by using accredited products.

Thames Water:

No objections raised.

Planning Considerations

The most relevant London Plan policies are as follows:

Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply.
Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban greening
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater Infrastructure
Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
Policy 5.16 Waste self-sufficiency
Policy 5.17 Waste capacity
Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
Policy 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
Policy 7.14 Improving Air Quality
Policy 7.17 Metropolitan Open Land
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature conservation
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (November 2012)

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development
BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure
BE8 Statutory Listed Buildings
BE10 Locally Listed Buildings
BE11 Conservation Areas
BE12 Demolition in Conservation Areas
BE14 Trees in Conservation Areas
H1 Housing Supply
H7 Housing Density and Design
H9 Side Space

NE7 Development and Trees
T3 Parking
T7 Cyclists
T18 Road Safety

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) documents are also a consideration in the determination of planning applications. These are:

SPG1 General Design Principles.
SPG2 Residential Design Guidance.
SPG: Bromley Town Centre Conservation Area.

Planning History

87/02304/FUL: First floor side extension. Approved 09.09.1987.

03/02890/OUT: Demolition of existing dwellings and erection of a three/four storey block comprising 11 two bedroom and 1 three bedroom flats, with new vehicular access and 11 car parking spaces at 7 and 9 Beckenham Lane OUTLINE. Refused 19.02.2004

04/02078/OUT: Demolition of existing dwellings and erection of a two/three storey building at front comprising 7 two bedroom flats and a three storey building at rear comprising 3 two bedroom flats, with new vehicular access and 14 car parking spaces at 7 & 9 Beckenham Lane (OUTLINE). Refused 12.08.2004.

04/04718/FULL1: Demolition of existing dwellings and erection of a two/three/four storey building comprising 9 two bedroom and 1 three bedroom flats with vehicular access and 12 car parking spaces at 7 & 9 Beckenham Lane. Refused 03.02.2005

The refusal reasons related to an overdevelopment of the site by reason of the amount of site coverage by buildings and hard surfaces and by the height and bulk of the proposed block of flats, which would harm the character and appearance of this part of the Bromley Town Centre Conservation Area. The proposal was also considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the adjacent Listed Buildings and their settings and visually intrusive when seen from neighbouring properties.

A subsequent Appeal was refused on 7/7/2006. The main considerations in the appeal were the effect on (i) the character and appearance of the Bromley Town Conservation Area; (ii) the setting of the adjacent listed buildings and (iii) the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

14/02967/FULL1: Demolition of existing building and replacement three storey building comprising 9 residential flats (3x2 bedroom and 6x3 bedroom), bin store, cycle store, 13 car parking spaces with alterations to existing vehicular/pedestrian access onto Beckenham Lane and front boundary wall max height 2 metres at Nos. 7-9 Beckenham Lane. Refused 29.01.2015

The refusal reasons related to the scale, height and bulk appearing cramped, obtrusive and detrimental to the character and appearance of the Bromley Town Centre Conservation Area. The proposal was also considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of Pixfield Court which is a Grade II Listed Building and Glebe Knoll which is a locally listed building and harmful to their settings. The proposal would also be overdominant and detrimental to the amenities that the occupiers of adjoining properties might reasonably expect to be able continue to enjoy by reason of visual impact and loss of prospect in view of its size and depth of rearward projection. Finally, the proposed flats, by reason of inadequate space standards, room layouts, a poor level of outlook and insufficient information to demonstrate how they would meet the changing needs of occupiers over their lifetimes, provided a substandard form of accommodation, prejudicial to the functionality of the proposed dwellings and detrimental to the amenity of their future occupiers.

Conclusions

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- o Principle of Development
- o Design, conservation and the effect to the setting of locally listed and listed buildings
- o Standard of Residential Accommodation
- o Highways and Traffic Issues
- o Impact on Adjoining Properties
- o Sustainability and Energy
- o Trees and Landscaping

Principle of Development

Housing is a priority use for all London Boroughs. Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply, Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential and Policy 3.8 Housing choice in the London Plan (2015) generally encourage the provision of redevelopment in previously developed residential areas provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides for garden and amenity space.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states in Paragraph 49 that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The NPPF sets out in paragraph 14 a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of decision-making, the document states that where a development accords with a local plan, applications should be approved without delay. Where a plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

The document also encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) and excludes gardens from the definition of previously developed land.

Policy H7 of the UDP advises that new housing developments will be expected to meet all of the following criteria in respect of; density; a mix of housing types and sizes, or provides house types to address a local shortage; the site layout, buildings and space about buildings are designed to a high quality and recognise as well as complement the qualities of the surrounding areas; off street parking is provided; the layout is designed to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists over the movement and parking of vehicles; and security and crime prevention measures are included in the design and layout of buildings and public areas.

Residential dwellings surround the site lay to the north, south and west of the site with open recreational land to the rear designated as Urban Open Space. The site is currently developed for a less dense residential use. Therefore, in this location the Council will consider residential infill development provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides for garden and amenity space. Any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, conservation and historic issues, biodiversity or open space will need to be addressed. Therefore the provision of the new flatted dwelling units on the land is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining and future residential occupiers of the scheme, car parking and traffic implications, sustainable design and energy, community safety and refuse arrangements.

Density

The density of the proposal would be 53 units per hectare (u/ha). Table 3.2 of the London Plan sets out the appropriate density range for a site with a PTAL of 3 in an urban area as 45-120 u/ha.

Given, the density of the proposal is within the guided density criteria the amount of development on site is considered suitable in principle at this location.

Design, Siting and Layout.

Policies 3.4 and 3.5 of the Further Alterations to the London Plan (March 2015) (FALP) reflect the same principles. Policy 3.4 specifies that Boroughs should take into account local context and character, the design principles (in Chapter 7 of the Plan) and public transport capacity; development should also optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range. This reflects paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to respond to local character and context and optimise the potential of sites.

Policy BE1 and H7 of the UDP set out a number of criteria for the design of new development. With regard to local character and appearance development should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout

and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. Development should not detract from the existing street scene and/or landscape and should respect important views, skylines, landmarks or landscape features. Space about buildings should provide opportunities to create attractive settings with hard or soft landscaping and relationships with existing buildings should allow for adequate daylight and sunlight to penetrate in and between buildings.

Policy H9 requires that new residential development for a proposal of two or more storeys in height a minimum of 1m side space from the side boundary is maintained and where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas. Proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space.

Policy BE11 states that in order to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas, a proposal for new development within a conservation area will be expected to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces and incorporate in the design existing landscape or other features that contribute to the character, appearance or historic value of the area; and ensure that the level of activity, traffic, parking services or noise generated by the proposal will not detract from the character or appearance of the area.

Policy BE8 details that applications for development involving the setting of a listed building will be permitted provided that the character, appearance and special interest of the listed building are preserved and there is no harm to its setting.

The application site occupies a prominent location on a sharp bend in Beckenham Lane. In previous submissions as detailed above, the principle of a flatted development in this location or to the contemporary design of the building when taken in isolation was considered acceptable. However, given the area's conservation status and its location in relation to listed and locally listed buildings adjacent it was considered that the size and positioning of previous proposals failed to respect the historical setting of its neighbours and would appear overly large and harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The current proposal has been revised from the 2014 submission and substantially from the 2004 submission to reduce the mass and scale of the replacement building on site. It is noted that the height is now similar to the existing building, however the width is still significantly greater with a much closer proximity to the boundaries of the site.

On balance, it is not considered that the concerns of the 2004 Appeal Inspector have been overcome and the revised development proposal remains to neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. In particular the building, despite being set back from the road, given its excessive width and scale would still appear unduly prominent within the street scene.

The 2004 Appeal Inspector also found that currently the siting of Nos 7 and 9 in front of the two listed and locally listed buildings, Pixfield Court and Glebe Knoll respectively, draws attention away from the listed buildings and adversely affects

their settings. It was further opined that the siting of a larger building in the same position as the existing houses would increase the detrimental effect on the settings of both Pixfield Court and Glebe Knoll.

The NPPF (2012) at paragraphs 129, 132 and 137 cumulatively address the issues of significance of heritage assets in relation to new proposals for development. Given this robust policy framework and conclusions of the 2004 Appeal prior to this, the current proposal is considered to result in a similar effect given its forward-siting, higher ground level, proximity to the boundary and overbearing façade facing Pixfield Court. This effect would remain to be exacerbated by the extra rearward projection of the development which although mitigated in part would protrude much further back than the existing pair of houses, particularly along the eastern side in close proximity to Glebe Knoll's entrance drive. Overall, this would remain to be harmful to the settings of both Pixfield Court and Glebe Knoll.

In terms of the design of the new building the elevations have been designed to have steps, gables, recesses and projections in order to provide visual interest and articulation to the elevation facades. While the design is only partly traditional in its format the approach is considered reflective of buildings in the locality by using a complimentary palette of materials and building design features. Therefore it is considered that the individual design approach of the building is a high quality design that will make a positive contribution to the streetscene and wider locality in this respect.

Standard of Residential Accommodation

Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2015) Quality and Design of Housing Developments states the minimum internal floorspace required for residential units on the basis of the level of occupancy that could be reasonably expected within each unit.

The floor space size of each of the 9 units ranges between 62.3m² and up to 80.6m² respectively. Table 3.3 of the London Plan requires various sizes of internal areas in relation to the number of persons and bedrooms provided in each unit. On this basis, the floorspace provision for all of the units is compliant with the required standards and is considered acceptable.

The shape and room size in the proposed building is considered satisfactory. None of the rooms would have a particularly convoluted shape which would limit their specific use.

Amenity Space

In terms of amenity space, provision is provided for ground floor flats within an external raised terrace area to the rear of the building. At first and second floor balconies are provided for flats 4, 5, 7, and 8 at 4.5m² and 1.5m depth respectively. No external space is provided for flats 6 and 9. A large communal garden area is indicated to the rear to be landscaped with many of the mature trees retained. This will be for use by all residents and is accessed from a side gate. While it is noted that the provision for the balconies is below London Plan guideline standards in

respect of flats 6 and 9, the provision is broadly acceptable at this location given the large communal area provided.

Highways and Car parking

Local residents have raised the issue of highway safety and are concerned that additional traffic generated by the development would result in a danger to road users, particularly given the site's location on a bend and the nearby primary school. The applicant has submitted a road safety audit stage 1 with the previous application which they have referenced in the submitted Combined Statement to the current application. The Council's Highway Officer has reviewed the current application and this is considered satisfactory subject to an appropriate visibility splay being provided. Thirteen spaces are to be provided on site which is considered satisfactory. Therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable from a highways safety perspective.

Cycle parking

Cycle parking is required to be 1 space per studio and 1 bedroom flats and 2 spaces for all other dwellings. The applicant has not provided details of a location for cycle storage for the units. Further details in this regard would have been requested had permission been forthcoming otherwise.

Refuse

All new developments shall have adequate facilities for refuse and recycling. The applicant has provided details of refuse storage for the units in the front curtilage accessed from Beckenham Lane. The location point is considered acceptable within close proximity of the highway.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan states that development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and ensure they are not harmed by noise disturbance, inadequate daylight, sunlight, and privacy or overshadowing.

With regard to the amenities of occupiers of adjacent buildings, concerns have been raised from local residents over the visual impact from the flats at Pixfield Court as well as from Glebe Knoll. In previous schemes it was acknowledged that the outlook from some of the windows in Pixfield Court would change as there would be more built development within the curtilage of the site.

In the 2004 Appeal scheme, the Inspector concluded that given the separation distances to the neighbouring building, this would not have been unduly harmful. Furthermore, it was considered that views would be partly screened by the mature trees and shrubs on the boundary.

In the current proposal, further reduction of the building in terms of height, footprint and revised design are described by the applicant in the Design and Accesses

Statement to make the proposal no longer appear overly dominant in order to address the reason for refusal in the 2014 scheme. On balance, while it is noted that this improves the over dominance of the building to some extent, it is considered that while the overall rearward projection would be slightly less than previously proposed, the development, due to its staggered rear building line and increasing depth on the eastern side, would remain to appear cumbersome and would still detract from existing views from flats within Pixfield Court. Furthermore, it is not considered that tree and shrub planting would sufficiently overcome the harm incurred to neighbouring occupier's outlook.

With regard to concerns raised over loss of privacy arising from the proposed balconies and windows, given the angles between the two buildings, no significant overlooking into neighbouring flats at Pixfield Court is anticipated. With regard to Glebe Knoll and the new development in its grounds, these buildings are sited a minimum of around 20 metres from the proposed block and there is unlikely to be a significant impact on the amenities of these occupiers.

Sustainability and Energy

Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction of the London Plan states that the highest standards of sustainable design and construction should be achieved in London to improve the environmental performance of new developments and to adapt to the effects of climate change over their lifetime. Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions of the London Plan states that development should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the hierarchy; Be Lean: use less energy; Be clean: supply energy efficiently and Be green: use renewable energy.

The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Report and Energy Statement which outlines that it will be possible for the development to meet these objectives. This approach is welcomed.

The proposal includes roof mounted photovoltaic panels which the applicant says will generate a reduction in carbon emissions of between 38.7% and 59.7%. Details are also provided regarding the energy efficiency of the proposed building's fabric, internal fittings and appliances, however, limited details of sustainable construction methods are given. While the proposal does not therefore fully address the requirements of Policy 5.3 of the London Plan, the proposal for on-site renewables is noted and, on balance, the proposal is considered acceptable from a sustainable design perspective.

An informative is recommended with any approval to ensure that the development strives to achieve these objectives.

Lifetime Homes

The applicant has confirmed that the development will be Lifetime Homes compliant.

Trees and Landscaping

An indicative landscaping layout has been submitted as shown on the proposed site plan drawing that details the areas given over to garden for external amenity for future occupiers. No objections are raised in this regard. Notwithstanding this full detail of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment can be sought by condition as necessary.

The application site is within a conservation area and due consideration should be weighted to the impact of the development on trees in and around the site. The plan proposes the retention of the majority of existing trees which are located mainly along the site perimeter including principal trees (T31, T32 and T33). Eleven trees are shown to be removed, however, these are not considered to be of significant amenity value. Some trees along the site's frontage are recommended for removal within the Arboricultural Report and this is considered acceptable in favour of replacement tree planting within a future comprehensive landscaping scheme.

Concerns are raised as to the potential impact on a group of mature sycamore forming a single canopy and located within Pixfield Court and whether they can be satisfactorily retained pre and post construction. Any future grant of planning consent should therefore include a condition requiring a schedule of pre-construction tree pruning/tree removal.

Community Infrastructure Levy

The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is payable on this application and the applicant has completed the relevant form.

Summary

Taking into account the issues discussed above it is considered that the development proposed would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, would be harmful to the settings of the adjacent listed buildings and would detract from views from Pixfield Court, harmful to the amenities of its occupiers.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed development by reason of its prominent siting, scale, massing, sub-standard spatial relationship to the existing and adjacent buildings in the locality in this prominent location, represents a cramped overdevelopment of the site which would appear detrimental to the character and appearance of the Bromley Town Centre Conservation Area and harmful to the visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies BE1, BE11, H7 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.**

- 2 The proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of Pixfield Court which is a Grade II Listed Building and Glebe Knoll which is a locally listed building and would be harmful to their settings, contrary to Policies BE8 and BE10 of the Unitary Development Plan.**

- 3 The proposed development would be over dominant and would be detrimental to the amenities that the occupiers of adjoining properties might reasonably expect to be able continue to enjoy by reason of visual impact and loss of prospect in view of its size, width and the depth of rearward projection, contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.**