**Devonshire Developments proposal for 76 A&B The Avenue**

Whilst this site could clearly accommodate redevelopment, this proposal is inappropriate.

It is clearly a massive overdevelopment of the site. At five storeys high it is bigger than anything nearby and presents a massive and overbearing front elevation to the street scene. One can expect something similar at 76 C and D which would create a truly imposing and inappropriate massing and bulk. The normal height of buildings nearby is 3 storeys or less although there are some where a part fourth storey exists (Morley Court) or a fourth storey is strongly mitigated (Nightingale Court). Thus the proposal is too high at 5 storeys and should be reduced to four which itself should be mitigated by including it within a pitched roof.

The plans are contradictory as some illustrations clearly indicate that there would not be the required 1m side space whilst others don’t, again indicating that this is an overdevelopment

External recreation space is minimal and wholly inadequate. At the front, there is wholly inadequate soft landscaping – large mature trees would be needed to screen such a vast building. At street level, there is inadequate space for bushes and shrubs to screen effectively the car park and bin store.

There is no landscaping along the long drive way and this only adds to the bleak and hard presence this proposal would present to the street scene

The consultation claims that the front and rear gardens of the mews houses are ‘generous’ but this is stretching the meaning of ‘generous’ in respect of the front gardens and the plans do not indicate clearly how big the rear gardens would be. In any event, such tandem development is unwelcome.

Internal plans are not, for the most part, provided and this suggests that something is being hidden. Presumably internal space is minimal. Indeed the information that is provided (and which is partially obscured) appears to show just 70.1SqM for a 2b4p flat and 51.1SqM for a 1b2p flat (cf recommended minima 70SqM and 50 SqM respectively). Thus, the accommodation is actually rather poor. Further, the eastern most sitting room appears to have inadequate natural light.

Architecturally, the building is unattractive. There is little detailing that people find attractive - variations in brickwork and stone mouldings typically found around windows or cornicing for example. The white bands between floors are boring and uninspiring. A pitched roof would be more appropriate and indeed is almost uniformly found nearby. Nearby Morley Court has a flat roof but this itself simply demonstrates that a flat roof is an inferior aesthetic to a pitched one. The building is anything but refined and sits poorly within its traditional context. We would suggest that a design more resembling 78, Wickham Road, Beckenham [https://www.google.co.uk/maps/@51.401209,-0.0181384,3a,36.1y,253.76h,87.45t/data=!3m6!1e1!3m4!1sam\_2CKKSUn\_RVPpX6YtUZQ!2e0!7i16384!8i8192?hl=en](https://www.google.co.uk/maps/%4051.401209%2C-0.0181384%2C3a%2C36.1y%2C253.76h%2C87.45t/data%3D%213m6%211e1%213m4%211sam_2CKKSUn_RVPpX6YtUZQ%212e0%217i16384%218i8192?hl=en) would respond better to the traditional context.

Regarding the road, we are unclear whether the majority of residents would want this to have a permanent surface. Whilst this would reduce dust, it also risks generating traffic which residents may not want. Further, it would need the permission of the freeholder of the road surface and we wonder if this has been obtained?

There is no comment about how the proposal would respond to ecological issues such as electricity generation and grey water re-use.
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