



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2023

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3311949

Oakcott, Yester Park, Chislehurst, BR7 5DG

- 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 D Thorpe against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/04897/FULL6, dated 4 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extensions and alterations to existing property'.
-

Preliminary matters

1. The application and drawings were modified during the period it was considered by the Council. I have determined this appeal on the basis of those amendments and as described on the Council's Decision Notice, namely 'porch canopy to front, part conversion of existing garage, enlargement of basement to use as habitable space, first floor front/side extension, and loft conversion comprising rear and side dormer, front rooflight and elevational alterations'.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a porch canopy to front, part conversion of existing garage, enlargement of basement to use as habitable space, first floor front/side extension, and loft conversion comprising rear and side dormer, front rooflight and elevational alterations at Oakcott, Yester Park, Chislehurst, BR7 5DG in accordance with the terms of the application ref DC/21/04897/FULL6, dated 4 October 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 5482-PD-01 Rev A, 5482-PD-02 Rev A, 5482-PD-03 Rev B, 5482-PD-04 Rev B & 5482-PD-05 Rev C

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within the Chislehurst Conservation Area, where I have a duty under s72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Area. This covers a large area with a diversity in forms of development and open space, with there being settlement areas set amongst wooded parts. This leads to the wider Conservation Area having a semi-rural character. The Chislehurst Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) appraises the component parts of the Area further, with the appeal property situated in suburban development from the inter-War period where there is generally consistency in scale and style. The significance of the Area as a heritage asset derives from the attractive semi-rural character of open space and settlement areas.
5. The appeal property displays the characteristics identified in the SPG of a characterful house dating from the inter-War period with typical features seen in high quality suburban housing of that time. This includes steeply pitched roofs, low eaves and dormer, a distinctive large catslide front roof and prominent chimneys. The drawings as originally submitted would have substantially altered this appearance, but the revisions to the scheme show recognition to retain the principal distinctive features of the building: the catslide roof is retained, with dormers of suitable scale and positioning, whilst the side and rear extensions show a design and form that keep the characteristically diverse roof structure and prominent chimneys. The changes to the fenestration, including to the altered porch, would be suitable changes to the appearance of the house.
6. The extensions and roof addition to the rear would increase the scale of the property, particularly when seen from the rear. But in such views the extended house would remain suitably proportioned; it would still be seen as a two storey house, with the roof receding in scale from the building below.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of houses in the vicinity that have been extended, following the grants of permission by the Council. These include examples where the depth of the house has increased and the form of the roof altered. They illustrate to me that properties can be successfully altered in appearance and increased in scale without there being any adverse impact on the Conservation Area, and that the Council have accepted such changes as being suitable. The proposals at Oakcott represent further change to the area where a house would be adapted and extended, yet still retain the character of a distinctive, attractive inter-War house.
8. I therefore find that the proposals would be of good design and not harm the existing building, and that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved. Thus, there would not be any harm to the significance of the heritage asset. The proposals are consistent with Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies 6, 37 and 41 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019, which seek a high standard of design in new development proposals

including extensions, and require development in conservation areas to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of such areas. The proposals area also consistent with the guidance in the SPG.

9. The appeal is therefore allowed. I have attached a condition requiring matching materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development. A condition specifying the approved plans is attached in the interest of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR