



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2025

by **Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G2245/D/25/3366820

9 Chipstead Park, Sevenoaks, TN13 2SL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Tina Hatton against the decision of Sevenoaks District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00009/HOUSE.
 - The development proposed is described as First-floor side and front extension. Raise height of roof and insert dormers to enable loft conversion. Single storey side extension, new front porch. New flue and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The first main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area. The second main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Chipstead Park (No.7), with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

3. Chipstead Park is a residential estate that was laid out in the mid 1960's and characterised by spaciouly sited bungalows and houses set within a mature landscaped and gently undulating garden setting. There is a mature landscaped area of open space to the south of the crescent in Chipstead Park which is within Chipstead Conservation Area (CCA). This together with the landscaped plots and occasional long distance views over the surrounding countryside contribute to the spacious and verdant character and appearance of Chipstead Park.
4. The appeal property is located at the end of a row of detached bungalows which occupy an elevated position above the road. Whilst not identical these bungalows have hipped roofs and most have pitched roof dormers that occupy a large part of their front roof slopes. These dormers emphasise the perceived height and prominence of the roofs of the dwellings. One of the bungalows also has a front projecting gable which breaks up the uniformity of the row and adds further to the perceived height and prominence of the roof of the dwelling.
5. The appeal dwelling comprises a detached chalet bungalow which appears particularly modest in form and height. This is due to the absence of dormer

windows and front projecting extensions and garages, along with its siting alongside the spacious rear garden to No.7. It's roof is hipped away from the plot's side boundaries and there is a tall fence along the boundary between the two properties. The rear garden and two storey dwelling at No.7 face towards and sit at lower level to the appeal property.

6. Directly opposite the appeal site is a row of uniformly designed two storey detached houses, which sit slightly below street level. Most of these dwellings have two storey front projections and in the vicinity of the appeal site these projections have hipped roofs. Further to the north the front facing projections have gable roofs. Together these small groups of similarly designed dwellings provide a sense of uniformity within this part of the street scene. Elsewhere within Chipstead Park the character is more varied although there are clusters of similarly designed dwellings.
7. Together and amongst other things policy SP1 of the Sevenoaks Core Strategy (CS) and policies EN1 & EN2 of the Sevenoaks Allocations and Development Management Plan (DMP), seek to ensure that proposals are designed to a high quality and respond to the scale, height, materials, site coverage and distinctive local character of the area. Proposals should also safeguard the living conditions of existing and future occupiers of neighbouring properties. The Sevenoaks District Council Residential Extensions-Supplementary Planning Document 2009 is consistent with this.

Character and appearance

8. With the proposal the overall height of the appeal dwelling would be raised by 1.375 metres. The roof would continue to be hipped away from the sides of the dwelling and the existing wing at the northern end of the dwelling would remain single story only. This would result in a gentle transition in heights between the appeal dwelling and the adjacent dwelling to the north. The two front facing dormer windows would respect the height of other dormer windows within the row of dwellings and the front porch and single storey side extension would be modest in form and appearance. Whilst the ridge height would be 1.375 metres higher it would be set behind the dormers and due to its location at the end of the row of dwellings would not interrupt the rhythm of the roofscape.
9. Conversely the projecting front gable would materially change the appearance of the dwelling creating a more complex roof form. It would fail to respect the simple form of the host dwelling and would emphasise the height and materially increase the bulk and prominence of the roof of the dwelling. Its impact on the street scene would be exacerbated by its elevated position above the highway and the rear garden at No.7, along with its proximity to the open junction area.
10. As stated in paragraph 4 of this decision there is a front gable at 15 Chipstead Park, however it is the same height as the row of dwellings and is not located alongside a distinct drop in ground levels. Rather than set a precedent it highlights the need to assess each proposal on its individual merits and in accordance with the prevailing planning policies.
11. For this reason, the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the street scene and the local area. This harm would outweigh the benefits for the appellant and their family that would result from the additional accommodation

and is not a matter that could be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions.

12. I have also considered the impact of the proposal on the landscaped area that falls within CCA. Due to the juxtaposition and distance between the landscaped area and the appeal dwelling I find that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the CCA.
13. I conclude on the first main issue that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the street scene and the local area. Accordingly, in this respect, it would conflict with CS Policy SP1 and DMP Policies EN1 and EN2.

Living conditions

14. The proposal would not increase the depth of the dwelling and although elevated and taller, the proposed replacement roof would be hipped away from the boundary with No.7. The proposed gable extension would materially add to the bulk and height of the resultant dwelling and the large expanse of tiling would be rather stark. This adds to my concerns regarding the size and appearance of the proposed gable projection.
15. Notwithstanding this, due to the limited depth of the resultant dwelling there would be open/mature landscaped views around much of the garden at No.7. Also, the appeal dwelling is sited at the opposite end of the garden to the main dwelling and away from the sitting out areas at No.7. Accordingly, whilst the proposal would reduce the open aspect to the rear of No.7, it would not be visually overbearing or have an unacceptable impact on the outlook from the dwelling, outbuilding and garden at No.7.
16. The proposed single storey side extension would be largely hidden by the existing boundary fence and its hipped roof would be modest in size and form and seen against the backcloth of the main dwelling.
17. Due to the width and size of the rear garden at No. 7, together with the distance between the appeal dwelling and the main sitting out areas and dwelling at No.7, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight for the occupiers of that property. It would be possible to see into the rear gardens of 5 Chipstead Park (No. 5) and No.7. However, such views would be at an oblique angle and in relation to No.5 they would be partially screened by existing planting.
18. The proposed first floor windows would be at a similar height to the first floor windows of the properties of the rear of the appeal dwelling. Not only do many dwellings within the estate have first floor rear facing windows, there are reasonable back-to-back distances with the properties concerned. Overall, I find the relationship between the proposed first floor windows and the surrounding properties typical of many housing estates.
19. I conclude on the second main issue that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the outlook from No.7. Accordingly, in this respect the proposal would comply with DMP Policy DM2.

Conclusion

20. Whilst I have found in favour of the appellant in relation to the second main issue and on various aspects of the proposal, the overall conclusion on the first main issue amounts to a compelling reason for dismissing this appeal.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR