



Ms L Bruce
Planning Officer
Bromley Council
Bromley Civic Centre
Stockwell Close
Bromley
Kent BR1 3UH

Dear Ms Bruce

Re: 14/05019/FULL – demolition of existing dwelling and replacement building comprising 5 two bedroom apartments and off road parking – 74 Madeira Avenue, Bromley BR1 4AB

Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society is a residents' association of approximately 500 subscribing members which concerns itself with the quality of the built environment in and around Shortlands.

We have considered this application and are opposed to it for the following reasons:-

1. Madeira Avenue and the surrounding roads are characterised by two storey semi-detached and detached properties which are occupied by families of varying ages. This is a large development with a design capacity for 18 people rather than a family home which the existing property is. As such it is completely uncharacteristic of the adjoining properties and the other buildings in the road.

Other properties which are above the level of Madeira Avenue have green areas or garden between them and the road whereas this development will have nothing but an area of bare paving like nothing else in the road.

Overall the scale, bulk and massing and general size of the proposal are excessive for the context and location. Whilst the design and impression may be of a large house as indicated by the Design and Access Statement viewing the building once built would lead anyone to come to the conclusion that the building comprised flats. The only block of flats in the road! The statement by the Developers that this is another block of flats (Falcon House) is wrong as Falcon House is actually in Highland Road.

2. As mentioned, Madeira Avenue and the surrounding area is characterised by two storey detached and semi-detached buildings. This proposal provides for effectively four stories of accommodation thereby setting it apart from the rest of the area and "sticking out like a sore thumb". We believe that the development if permitted will result in an unnecessary increase in acceptable density level thereby setting a precedent for similar developments in the future. This will result in a loss of family housing in an essentially familial area being as it is only a short walk from the local school; losing family stock such as this within walking distance of the school contradicts the Council's wish to reduce the amount of traffic on the roads.
3. The footprint of the building notwithstanding the comments of the architects is bigger than the existing property; in practice the building will visually be bigger than the other properties

in the part of the road, imposing itself on the streetscene and out of character with its surroundings.

4. The car parking proposed whilst off street means that there is no soft landscaping at the front of the building, just bare concrete which is in complete contrast to the adjoining and other properties particularly in this part of the road and the surrounding area in general. We have already mentioned the characteristics of other properties. This development is therefore unacceptable and out of character to the area.
5. If permitted the development will lead to further increased use of the road which is already crowded such that executing a three point turn is difficult at time during the day. The parking survey was conducted at 'quiet' parking times; residents can readily attest to the pressure on parking which is already experienced and the loss of two parking spaces outside the property will accentuate the existing problems. Also what are the red and green "blobs" on the applicant's parking survey actually indicating? Further, it would be reasonable to assume that the occupants of the flats, like many households, will have more than one car which will inevitably increase the pressure on the available parking in the road as well as increasing the risk of accidents with other vehicles and possible people.
6. The extension of the building to the rear although not visible from the road will lead to an unacceptable impact upon neighbours' rear gardens, in particular those to the north due to the domination of the neighbouring premises from the increased height and mass of the proposed building. We believe also that the rear windows will result in a loss of privacy for the residents of the neighbouring property. Perversely in our view there is insufficient fenestration for some of the larger rooms proposed for the development.

As no doubt you will have already noted when considering the application the applicant has not illustrated how the proposed building sits relative to the existing houses enabling objectors to give full thought to its impact – how will the neighbours be able to assess the proposals without a site plan showing the foot print of this proposed development in relation to their properties? Also there is no comparative indicator showing the current elevations and the proposed elevations with which to judge the application.

We are further surprised that notwithstanding the comments in the Design and Access Statement about the trees on the site at least one of which will have to be removed no arboricultural report has been submitted with the application.

Access to the cycle store would be difficult on account of parked cars immediately in front of it whilst there is no safe space on the curtilage for the storage of recycling containers on collection days.

If the Council do decide to grant consent then there should be very strict conditions attached to the movement of vehicles in connection with the development so as to reduce the chance of damage to parking vehicles by the movement of heavy lorries to and from the site. In addition we believe the Council should insist upon full compliance with the current legislation relating to disabled access.

Yours sincerely

[Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society](#)

[Latest news](#) | [About us](#) | [Join us](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Facebook](#)