

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/16/3163623
10 Oakwood Close, Chislehurst, BR7 5DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms O'Neill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/03517/FULL6 dated 25 July 2016 was refused by notice dated 7 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension, single storey side and rear extension, first floor front extension, rear dormers, chimney stack and elevational alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached house located on the southern side of Oakwood Close. The properties along this cul-de-sac comprise of large detached dwellings, set in spacious plots. There is variation in the built form of properties in the area and although they are generally set close together, the predominately hipped roofs provide views towards trees and vegetation in rear gardens areas. The low and open front boundaries further provide a mature landscape setting which contributes to the openness and verdant character of the Conservation Area, within which the appeal site is located.
 4. The proposal seeks a number of extensions including a two-storey side and rear extension and a first floor front extension together with alterations to the front elevation. The development would result in a significantly increased width of the roof at ridge height which would add considerable bulk to the building. Whilst I recognise that there is a diversity in the roof types in the Conservation Area, the appeal property currently has a long sloping roof form which comes down to the ground floor eaves height on the east of the property. The proposal would represent a noticeable increase in the scale of the building and
-

would reduce views to the rear and diminish the spacious setting, which forms an important element of the character of the Conservation Area.

5. The Council also raise concerns about the loss of the tile hung façade at first floor level and the additional gable feature on the front elevation. However, the gable feature would replicate the existing front gable but with smaller proportions, appearing in itself as a subservient addition. There is also a range of materials utilised on the front elevations of nearby properties and I do not consider that the loss of the tile hung front elevation would be seen as an unsympathetic alteration. However, this does not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Conservation Area that I have identified above.
6. I therefore conclude that the development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building and that it would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area. As such, it would conflict with Policies BE1, BE11 and H8 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan, which seek, amongst other matters, development that is of a high standard of design, that does not detract from the existing streetscene or landscape, and respects features that contribute to the character, appearance or historic value of the area. It would also be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seeks to conserve or enhance the historic environment. There are no public benefits which have been put forward which would outweigh the harm that I have identified (in respect of Paragraph 133 of the Framework).

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including the general reference by the appellant to planning policy requirements, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR