



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 August 2023 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3326264

21 Green Lane, Bromley, Chislehurst BR7 6AG

- 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 Mrs Denise Fellows (AA Gibbons Ltd) against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application ref. DC/22/03672/FULL6, dated 14 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'rear dormer loft conversion to terraced property'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The immediate area is defined by narrow two-storey terraced and semi-detached dwellings of matching traditional design and materials. The dwellings that border this section of Green Lane are set back from the road by small front gardens providing open vistas in both directions along the highway framed by the largely unaltered front elevations and roof slopes. Rear elevations are also largely original with some limited alterations. Whilst rear roof slopes contain a greater number of roof lights, their form remains intact maintaining their attractive uniformity. The appeal property is reflective of the character of the surrounding dwellings, adding to the homogeneity of the terrace, contributing positively to the significance of the CA.
5. The proposed roof lights within the front slope would appear cluttered given the narrowness of the building and incongruous in the context of the largely blank roof slopes of the wider terrace, disrupting consistency. The dormer would span almost the entirety of the rear roof slope, creating a bulky and thus prominent feature when viewed from surrounding rear gardens. It would have a similar interrupting effect to the largely unaltered roof scape of the locality. The fact it would be to the rear would not be sufficient to reduce its harmful effect.

6. With this in mind, the proposal would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Given the scale and location of the scheme, the harm would be less than substantial for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) which also sets out that, in this instance harm should be weighed against the public benefits.
7. Whilst the proposal would provide additional living space for the appellant, the weight attributable would be limited due to its stated private nature. Furthermore, no additional public benefits have been identified which would be consequently capable of outweighing the great weight that I am required to give to the harm that would be caused to the significance of this designated heritage asset. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to Policies 6, 37, and 41 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan 2019, which collectively require new development to preserve and enhance the characteristics of Conservation Areas by complementing the scale and form of existing buildings.

Other Matters

8. I have not been made aware of the full circumstances of other examples of similar developments in the area. It is unclear whether they benefit from express planning permission. In any event, their presence does not justify the harm I have found which is specific to the proposed development and its location. There is some suggestion of affordability being an issue for moving a growing family elsewhere but no detailed evidence to support it. It is also unclear as to whether the additional space required could be provided in a different way and avoid/reduce acceptably the harms that would arise.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the approach of the Framework and worthy of sufficient weight, that would indicate otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR