
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/17/3173935
10 Cromlix Close, Chislehurst BR7 5SJ

- 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 Mr Jinrong Liu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/16/05269/FULL6, dated 15 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor side/front extension over an existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a first floor side/front extension over an existing garage at 10 Cromlix Close, Chislehurst BR7 5SJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/16/05269/FULL6, dated 15 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BL/10CC/P/02, BL/10CC/P/03, BL/10CC/P/06 and BL/10CC/P/07.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Procedural Matter

2. An amended description was used on the Council's decision notice but there is no indication that this description was agreed between the parties. I have used the description as given on the application form in my decision. For the sake of clarity my decision covers the extensions shown on the plans which include a rear conservatory extension.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including its effect on the Chislehurst Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached house of mid/late 20th century date which is situated off the end of Cromlix Close. A bungalow has recently been built in part of its rear garden and this has frontage onto Summer Hill. This has significantly reduced the size of the garden to the property as originally built. However the house remains surrounded by an adequate garden area for the scale of the building.
5. Although the house is at a higher level than Cromlix Close it is set back some distance from that road. There are trees within its garden and in neighbouring gardens which conceal the property to a large extent given its siting at an angle to the road. There is also generous tree cover along Summer Hill which screens the property from view from that road.
6. The overall width and height of the building as seen from the front would not be increased. The house is seen in conjunction with its immediate neighbour at N^o 12 when approaching from Cromlix Close. Although the extension would introduce bulk at first floor level which would be seen in association with the adjacent house, the clear separation of the two buildings is apparent when approaching along the drive. Because of its siting in relation to the road and the landscape screening the proposal would have a very limited effect on the street scene.
7. For these reasons and given that the proposed extension would match the existing house in terms of its design and materials the proposal would accord with policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan¹ (UDP) which requires a high standard of design and layout. Policy H8 of the UDP has similar requirements as well as requiring that spaces or gaps between buildings are respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area. The proposal would affect the space between the house and its neighbour only to a limited extent and this effect would not be significant in the context of the overall character of the area. I find that the scale of the extended dwelling would remain in keeping with its surroundings in terms of its garden and the spaces around adjacent buildings and the resulting dwelling would not appear cramped. For these reasons the requirements of policy H8 would be met.
8. The Chislehurst Conservation Area is divided into character sub-units. The site is within sub-unit 6 which covers Summer Hill and Old Hill. Summer Hill falls between the commons and the railway station and has a sylvan character with occasional buildings close to the road frontage and others set back. The Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Conservation Area describes the strong characteristic of this character sub-unit as being the generally organic nature of its development. The area contains a cohesive but diverse mixture of building styles with a complex and stimulating layout. The adjoining parts of Cromlix Close and the remainder of the housing estate off Norlands Crescent are within a separate character sub-unit. This is a modern housing development with the houses having a unified and cohesive appearance.
9. The appeal property and N^o 12 differ from the rest of the estate because they are individually designed. The proposal would not harm the character of the Conservation Area in terms of its organic nature and diverse building styles. Because of its secluded setting and its lack of visibility from Summer Hill I find

¹ London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006)

that the character and appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area would be preserved. For the reasons given the proposal would accord with policy BE11 of the UDP which requires development in Conservation Areas to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces. The Council has no objection to the proposed rear conservatory and I concur with this view. For the reasons given the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

10. Conditions are necessary in order to ensure that development is undertaken in accordance with the approved plans and that details of materials are submitted to the Council for approval, in order to provide certainty and to ensure the appearance of the development is acceptable.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR