
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2019

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/19/3233708

The Glade, 28 Park Avenue, Farnborough, Orpington BR6 8LH

- 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 Rob Corbett against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/19/01486/FULL6, dated 28 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is erect a double storey side and rear extensions, with façade changes and a loft conversion to the main roof area with rear facing dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to erect a double storey side and rear extensions, with façade changes and a loft conversion to the main roof area with rear facing dormers at The Glade, 28 Park Avenue, Farnborough, Orpington BR6 8LH in accordance with the terms of planning application, ref: DC/19/01486/FULL6 dated 28 March 2019 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:
 - Drawing no. P4 Rev B dated 08/10/2018 – Proposed Floor Roof and Elevation Plans
 - Drawing no. P2 Rev B dated 08/10/2018 – Existing and Proposed Site Plans
 - Drawing no. P1 Rev B dated 08/10/2018 – Location Plan
 - 3) No development above foundation level 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.
 - 4) No development shall commence until there shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority a scheme of landscaping. The scheme shall include indications of all existing trees and

hedgerows on the land, identify those to be retained and set out measures for their protection throughout the course of development.

- 5) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 6) The details submitted in accordance with condition 4 above shall include measures to retain and protect the Oak tree identified as tree T6 in the Arboricultural Report by Chartwell Tree Consultants Ltd dated 18th December 2018.

Procedural Matters

2. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Farnborough Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey detached house, in a good-sized plot on the corner of Park Avenue and The Glen within the Farnborough Park Conservation Area (FPCA). The house fronts onto Park Avenue with side wall facing The Glen. It has ground and first floor bay windows to the front elevation, is designed with hipped tiled roof and is a rendered structure said to date to the 1930's.
5. Policy 6 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Development Framework Local Plan of January 2019 (LP) requires residential extensions to be of a scale, form and materials that respect or complement the host dwelling and are compatible with development in the surrounding area. It also requires spaces and gaps to be respected where they contribute to character and for dormer windows to be appropriate to the roof scape. Policy 37 of the LP provides the general guiding principles for design; requiring good architectural quality and development that is complementary in its form to adjacent buildings and the area. Policy 41 of the LP relates to development in conservation areas, sets out the requirements of the Act and confirms that development should respect existing buildings and spaces, respect existing landscape and other features that contribute to character and use high quality materials.
6. In relation to extensions, the Supplementary Planning Guidance for Farnborough Park Conservation Area (SPG) advises that most buildings in the conservation area present a carefully considered front façade as a significant element of their design. The continued appreciation of these façades is an important conservation objective. The SPG states that side extensions should be subsidiary in scale and protect the strong landscape framework; major extensions are preferred to the rear.

7. The SPG describes the chief interest of the CA as the innovative way that the Rogers family incorporated pre-existing landscape into a high-quality built environment, allowing scope for the construction of large and individualistic private homes in a manner more typical of American suburban development than of development of a similar age in England.
8. The appeal site is somewhat of an anomaly in the FPCA. Its modest appearance and unassuming design contrasts with the rather larger dwellings which together with the landscape structure, make up the character and quality of Farnborough Park.
9. The buildings on adjacent plots are generally much wider than the appeal property. Thus, the increase proposed in the frontage elevation of the appeal property, with a significant side extension, would not be at odds with the prevailing character. The step down and back of the side return would allow the extension to sit acceptably with the existing building. Its hipped roof and mansard type detail with tile hanging marries with the existing tile hanging between the bay windows.
10. The side elevation extends a considerable distance parallel with, and between 8 and 9 metres from, The Glen frontage. Although a long elevation, design details have been incorporated into the elevation to break up its scale and mass. These include a change in width and change in eaves height, tile hanging to the upper storey and hipped roof. In my view these details add interest and quality to the design of the elevation in views towards the site and minimise the appearance of additional bulk.
11. The rear of the existing house is visible in views on the approach to the site along The Glen and, has no particular visual quality as an elevation. The extension would subsume much of the existing rear elevation. The new rear facing gable on the side return would be the most visible element of the development in this view. Set in from the boundary, and with a lower eaves and ridge height, compared to the main roof, the gable is not an excessive scale. The central external chimney adds interest and breaks up the elevation. This gable elevation projects beyond the remaining rear extension. The views towards the rear as a whole would be seen in the context of significant retained garden space and would not be especially prominent in the FPCA.
12. Overall, I conclude that the extension would sit comfortably in its surroundings and respect the variety of design and siting of dwellings within the FPCA. Accordingly, there would be no harm to the significance of the conservation area, and the development would meet the statutory test of preserving the character of this part of the FPCA. Further, the scheme would meet the requirements of policies 6, 37 and 41 of the LP and accord with the SPG.
13. FPCA is a designated heritage asset as defined in the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). Paragraph 193 states that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm. Paragraph 194 states that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the design of the extension would preserve the character of the conservation area. There would be no harm to its character or appearance and, even when attaching great weight to the importance of the heritage asset, I find the details of the development to be

acceptable. Consequently, I consider that the scheme complies with the requirements of the Framework.

Other Matters

14. The small group of mature trees on the side boundary adjacent to The Glen are an important element of the street scene and good landscape structure would be significant to the grounding of the extension in its environment. The SPG states that together, trees and shrubs make up much of the landscape framework that provides the Park with its distinctive character. Planning permissions would normally be subject to a landscape condition. In this case the development is supported by an arboricultural report. This report suggests the removal of tree T6 but the Council considers this could be retained. I agree that this tree should be retained as part of the development where possible. Appropriate conditions are needed to secure a landscape framework for the development and to ensure existing trees are retained to protect and enhance landscape.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition relating to materials in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the area. Landscaping conditions are required to protect the special character of the FPCA.
16. The Council did not request any additional conditions on the appeal questionnaire but has commented on suggested conditions that the retention and protection of tree T6 (as identified in the arboricultural report) should be sought. Condition 6 clarifies that the requirements of condition 4 applies to tree T6. I agree that it would clarify the requirement to retain tree T6 and in the interests of the protection of landscape character of the conservation area conditions 4, 5 and 6 are required.

Conclusion

17. I have considered the matters before me and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR