

**Section '3' - Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT**

**Application No :** 15/02772/FULL1

**Ward:**  
**Chislehurst**

**Address :** Hollybank Manor Park Road Chislehurst  
BR7 5PY

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 544467 N: 169847

**Applicant :** Mr James McDonnell

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a detached two storey five bedroom house with accommodation in the roof, to include elevational alterations. Part retrospective application.

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Chislehurst  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds  
Local Distributor Roads  
Smoke Control SCA 16

**Proposal**

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the original dwelling and the construction of a detached two storey five bedroom house with accommodation in the roofspace. The application is part retrospective (as the original bungalow has already been demolished and a new two storey house constructed).

The site had previously received planning permission for alterations to the original bungalow, to convert it into a two storey dwelling (see planning history), however, instead of implementing these permissions the original bungalow was demolished and an entirely new building constructed which varied from the approved planning permissions. The applicant advised that during the course of the construction of the approved extensions to the bungalow it became necessary, due to structural issues, to fully demolish the external walls and re-build.

This current application therefore seeks to regularise the position, by proposing a number of amendments to the existing dwelling that seek to address the outstanding concerns

Key Designations  
Conservation Area: Chislehurst

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds  
Local Distributor Roads

### Proposal

This application has been submitted following the refusal of retrospective application (Ref: 13/02486) (which sought the demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of a detached two storey four bedroom house), and the dismissal of the subsequent appeal (Ref: APP/G5180/W/14/3000100).

This application seeks planning permission for the existing dwelling on the site subject to a number of proposed alterations to address the issues raised in the Inspector's report in respect of appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/14/3000100.

The proposed alterations to the existing dwelling can be summarised as follows:

- o Removal of the tile hanging to the smaller gable façade at first floor level of the western elevation (Church Lane) and its replacement with white rendering;
- o Replacement of the tile hanging to the two largest gable ends on the southern (Manor Park Road) and western (Church Lane) elevation, and replacement with white render and exposed hardwood effect beams;
- o Addition of scalloped feature tile hanging in two coursed bands on the western and southern facades at first floor level;
- o Replacement of the existing glazed balcony balustrade with gloss white painted hardwood handrail and moulded newels, and toughened glazed panels for safety, to provide a more traditional look;
- o The installation of a fibreglass chimney with chimney pots towards the front of the house, designed with brick cladding to match the existing ground floor brick work;
- o Installation of three gloss white painted shaped hardwood finials, positioned one at each of the gable ends; and
- o Replacement of the ground and first floor windows on the southern elevation and first and roof floor windows on the western elevation, with windows with substantial central mullions and smaller upper lights, to give a more traditional look.

### Location

Hollybank occupies a prominent location on the corner of Church and Manor Park Road, opposite St Nicholas Church (Grade II\* Listed). The site is within the Chislehurst Conservation Area where higher standards of design are required.

## **Consultations**

### Objections

A letter of objection has been received from the occupiers of Mereworth and the comments therein are summarised below:

- The amendments in the current application are entirely inappropriate for the location;
- The dwelling is poorly designed;
- The building should be demolished and something more suitable constructed in a different position on the site;
- If the property is not to be demolished the objector lists a number of changes that should be carried out as an absolute minimum to limit the damaging effect of the building on the area including the following:  
Replace the gable end to the front elevation with a hipped end; lower the height of the roof; the roof tiling should be re-specified with a tile with some colour variation; tiling to first floor level should be removed and replaced with render and painted white (the proposal to do this in minor areas will have little effect); the windows should be completely reviewed smaller window units with mullions and transoms should be provided; the balcony handrail is the only part of the proposal that addresses the problem in that area.

### Support

A letter of support has been received from a resident living opposite the site, White Gates and the comments therein are summarised below:

- White Gates is the only house facing Hollybank and therefore the only one directly affected by the look of the house.
- The site was originally occupied by a fairly plain bungalow. No two houses are the same and the diversity of design was one of the attractions of living in the road.
- Hollybank has enhanced the site, has been constructed on substantively the same footprint as the bungalow to a very high standard using quality materials. The materials used are similar to those to be found on at least three other houses in Manor Park Road.
- The house is in keeping with the other houses in the road and has enhanced the overall character and look of the road.

### Comments from Consultees

Thames water raised no objections

Drainage raised no objections

Environmental Health (Housing) raised no objections.

APCA - the proposed alterations are not a sufficient enhancement of the existing building required in accordance with policies BE1 and B11.

The Council's Heritage and Design officer is of the view that the proposed revisions to the scheme will be sufficient to address the concerns previously expressed by officers and those raised by the Inspector in respect of appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/14/3000100), the most significant of which related to the tile cladding and limited extent of decorative panels, window detailing and lack of central mullions, and the appearance of the balcony.

## Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development  
BE11 Conservation Areas  
BE12 Demolition in conservation areas  
H1 Housing Supply  
H7 Housing Density and Design  
H9 Side Space  
NE7 Development and trees  
T3 Parking

SPG No.1 - General Design Principles  
SPG No.2 - Residential Design Guidance  
Chislehurst Conservation Area SPG

The application also falls to be considered in accordance with relevant London Plan policies (March 2015), in particular Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology and Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage.

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)  
Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (November 2012)

### Planning History

13/04286 - Planning permission (Retrospective) was refused for the demolition of the existing house and erection of a detached two storey 4 bedroom house with accommodation in the roofspace (Amendment to permission Ref: 12/01099 to include elevational alterations).

The application was refused on the grounds that:

'the proposed development by reason of incongruous materials, is harmful to the character and visual amenities of this part of the Chislehurst Conservation Area, contrary to Policies BE1, H7 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Conservation Area'

The subsequent appeal (APP/G5180/W/14/3000100) was dismissed, on the grounds that the existing building detracts from the character and appearance of the area around the Church and Common, and the Inspector was unable to conclude that the proposed revisions would overcome the stark and incongruous appearance of the building, however the Inspector made a number of suggestions in his appeal decision in respect of possible revisions to the scheme.

Whilst the Inspector considered that, when viewed from the public domain the building appears as a bulky and incongruous feature which fails to reflect the character and appearance of the other nearby properties which face onto the

churchyard and Common, he was of the view that the proposed changes indicated on the application drawings would result in a property that is less stark in appearance than the existing building. Consequently it would be more in keeping with the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. However, he indicated that the application lacked sufficient detail for a clear indication of the final appearance of the building to be gained. In considering the appeal, the Inspector indicated that, whilst the design and appearance of some of the features could be secured through the use of conditions requiring detailed drawings and specifications to be submitted to and approved by the Council before the start of the works, other features in particular the tile cladding and corbelled brickwork, could result in substantial changes to the property which in normal circumstances would be open to public consultation as part of the planning application process. Taking into account the cumulative amount and type of detail which would require agreeing to overcome the stark and incongruous appearance of the appeal property, the Inspector concluded that the use of conditions to secure the satisfactory appearance of the property would be inappropriate.

12/01099 - Planning permission was granted for roof alterations and an extension to the existing dwelling to form a 4 bedroom two storey dwelling house. The building resulting from this permission broadly reflects the size and design of the dwelling that has now been constructed.

10/02384 - Planning permission was refused at Committee contrary to officer's recommendation but subsequently granted on appeal for roof alterations and an extension to the existing dwelling to form a 3 bedroom two storey dwelling house.

92/02106 - Planning permission was granted for a single storey side extension.

## **Conclusions**

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the Chislehurst Conservation Area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding residential properties.

As discussed above, the site had previously received planning permission for alterations to the original bungalow to convert it into a two storey dwelling (Ref: 10/2384, 12/01099). However, instead of implementing these permissions the original bungalow was demolished and an entirely new building constructed which varied from the approved planning permissions. The applicant advised the Council that during the course of the construction of the approved extensions to the bungalow it became necessary, due to structural issues, to fully demolish the external walls and re-build.

It is considered that the principle of a two storey dwelling, and of a dwelling of broadly the same height and scale that has been constructed on the site has been established by the previous permissions (Refs: 10/2384 (granted on appeal), and 12/01099). The siting and footprint of the dwelling is also broadly the same as the original bungalow.

The height of the previously approved schemes (Refs. 10/2384 and 12/01099) were 9.1 metres and 8.4 metres respectively. In allowing the appeal on application ref. 10/02384 the Inspector took the view that the proposal would be of a similar height to the adjacent property at Mereworth (given the changes proposed). In terms of the current scheme, the 'as-built' height of 8.8m was therefore considered acceptable.

The level of separation between the dwelling 'as-built' on the site and the boundaries with Church Lane and Mereworth has been maintained, the overall footprint of the dwelling remains broadly similar to the original dwelling, and the elevation of Hollybank facing Mereworth is hipped in nature. It is, therefore, not considered that the current application proposal would have any greater impact on the amenities of the occupiers of Mereworth than the previously approved schemes (Refs: 12/01099, and 10/02384). It is also noted that the principal of the gables to the western elevation has already been established. In the previous appeal decision (Ref: AP/11/00038) the Inspector also noted that the inclusion of the gables on the western elevation would add interest to the local scene. The principle of the southern gable was also accepted under the recently approved scheme (Ref: 12/01099).

As the principle of a two storey dwelling of broadly the same height, scale and footprint as the dwelling 'as-built' has been established the issues that remain for consideration in respect of this application are the differences between what has previously been approved and the 'as-built' scheme and whether the revisions proposed as part of this application are sufficient to ensure that the building is not in any way detrimental to, but preserves and enhances, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In terms of policies BE1 and BE11, as previously stated, the principle of a two storey dwelling on approximately the same footprint and of broadly the same scale and height has already been established. In terms of the materials used, there are a number of other examples of dwellings with similar design features and types and colours of materials. It is noted that there are a number of properties both in close proximity to the site and elsewhere in the Conservation Area of various ages that have been constructed using materials of a similar colour to those used in the construction of Hollybank. In addition, no material variation in the level of activity at the site including traffic, parking, or noise is considered likely to be generated by the replacement dwelling.

It is considered that the proposed revisions to the scheme including the elevational alterations and a reduction in the area of tile hanging and its replacement with white render, replacement windows, balustrade, inclusion of additional design features, will soften the appearance of the building, and also replace some of the modern materials with more traditional materials.

Whilst the design of the property is different to some of the properties immediately adjoining the site, it does reflect the style of some of the other properties nearby and elsewhere in the Chislehurst Conservation Area. With the additional revisions

and design features proposed as part of this application it is considered that the design of the building will not be out of character with the surrounding area and it will not be detrimental to, but will preserve and enhance, the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In summary, the principle of the majority of the development has already been established under planning application Refs: 12/01099 and 10/2384. It is considered that the proposed revisions will help to soften the appearance of the scheme. The proposal is not considered likely to result in any material loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the conservation area. No significant impact on trees or highway safety will result. It is considered that the proposed revisions to the building adequately address the concerns that have been raised in respect of this development and permission should be granted.

### **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.**

- 2 The proposed alterations as detailed in the application shall be implemented within four calendar months of the date of this decision notice and shall be permanently maintained thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.**