



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2024

by N Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st MRCH 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/24/3336352

12 Wimborne Avenue, Chislehurst, Bromley BR7 6RQ

- 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 Ayoola Owoseni against the decision of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/23/03751/FULL6, dated 2 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a two storey front extension, first floor rear extensions, loft conversion and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner heading above I have used the description of proposed development that was provided on the planning application form. However, the description differs on the Council's decision notice and the appellant's planning appeal form. Those documents describe the proposed development to be a two storey front extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion to include front dormers and elevational alterations.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on the relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Marlings Park Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

Reasons

5. The ASRC is characterised by Neo Tudor and Arts and Crafts architectural styles, which the ASRC comments '*gives pride of place to English vernacular features*'. There is a distinctiveness to many of the properties in this area that gives it a strong sense of place. The roofscapes and external finishes are a strong feature. Many properties host half-timber/render, clay tiled and brick, chimneys and, I saw in the locality of the appeal site, pitched and hipped

rooflines are a common feature. The ASRC, therefore, contains particular features which contribute to the area's character and appearance.

6. Nonetheless, I also saw that some of the dwellings close by have been remodelled and have taken on a modern appearance. Those remodelled properties have render finishes, plain grey roof tiles and grey aluminium doors and windows. From the Marlings Park Estate ASRC map some of those properties, like the appeal property, fall just within the denoted ASRC.
7. Unlike the majority of the properties in the area that are two storey, the appeal property is a bungalow. The appeal property has none of the attributes listed in the ASRC architectural characterisation and has been subject to extension. It adjoins a bungalow and a recent development site for a pair of contemporary styled semi-detached dwellings, both within the ASRC. My attention has been drawn to other properties within close proximity to the appeal site that do not host those design attributes of properties within the wider ASRC. Given a number of properties within the vicinity of the appeal site that have taken on a modern approach, I consider a contemporary design approach would not be out of keeping at this location.
8. That said, the second storey and accommodation within the roof would add significantly to the size of the property. Furthermore, the overall size and crown form of the roof would not reflect that of other properties within the ASRC that are of pitched roof design, including those properties that have been modernised or recently constructed. The double storey projecting entrance hall, which includes a large expanse of glazing, would in particular appear unsympathetic, at odds with, and unrelated to, the character and appearance of any of properties within the street scene.
9. Consequently, whilst I find that the contemporary design approach of the proposal would not be out of character with the area, the scale and design of the proposed extension as a whole would result in an overly large development and would be an unsympathetic development within this street scene. The proposal would also represent an overly large addition to the existing dwelling.
10. I acknowledge that permitted development would allow for the existing dwelling to be extended in various ways but it does not appear to me that such permitted development would facilitate all of the changes proposed within this application, notably that of the increased height of the dwelling. The existence of permitted development rights offers little support for the proposal and I give this little weight in favour of the proposed development.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area irrespective of the ASRC designation. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019). These policies seek, amongst other matters, new development, including residential extensions, to be of a high-quality design that respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR