



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2022

by N Praine BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 MARCH 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/21/3283896

28 Kendall Road, Beckenham BR3 4PZ

- 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 Chris Trantom against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/01752/FULL1, dated 6 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is for the demolition of an existing single-storey side extension and erection of a two-storey side extension to the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 28 Kendall Road is a two-storey end-of-terrace property sited on a prominent corner plot adjoining Kendall Avenue. The appeal site falls within a special residential character area and the character of Kendall Road is predominantly two storey terraced dwellings with a uniform character of front gable and two storey bay windows. There is consistent use of brick and white plaster/stone and tiled roofs. No 28 follows this uniform character.
4. Adjoining streets Kendall Avenue and Betts Close introduce more variation with detached, semi-detached, and terraced properties. Some of the dwellings in Kendall Avenue follow the character of Kendall Road whereas others introduce more diversity to the design, materials, and appearance of the street scene.
5. The proposed development would demolish the existing part render part brick single-storey side extension and erect a two-storey side extension to No 28. The front wall of the proposed extension would curve to align with the front wall of the main house at No 28. It would extend fully to the side boundary and the rear wall of the extension would align with the rear wall of the main dwelling just before the rear outrigger. The proposed extension would have a flat roof with timber cladding and aluminium framed windows and doors.
6. Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan 2019 (the Local Plan) states that development proposals of two or more storeys in height require a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site for the full height and length of the building. The plans show that the proposed development would be built up

- to the flank boundary for the full height and length of the building in conflict with Policy 8 of the Local Plan. This weighs against the development proposal.
7. The front building line would be respected, and the footprint would remain the same as the existing building. However, the proposed two storey extension would be taller than the existing side projection it would replace. This, in combination with the absence of separation to the side boundary at this prominent corner location, would create a cramped, incongruous, and bulky addition to the host dwelling.
 8. Policy 6 of the Local Plan states that the design and layout of proposals should complement the scale, form and materials of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the area. This is amplified in the supporting text to Policy 6 which states that flat-roofed side extensions of two or more storeys to dwellings of traditional roof design would normally be resisted unless the extension is well set back from the building line and is unobtrusive.
 9. The materials and design including the flat roof would contrast with the host dwelling and the established character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy 6 and its supporting text. That said, I understand that new and imaginative forms of architecture can be appropriate in some instances and that a more traditional design has previously been refused by the Council. However, in this case, I consider the uniform character of Kendall Road has a pleasing unity of appearance. The proposed development's contrasting design and materials would not complement the established character and would disrupt the unity of the street scene. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.
 10. I note there is an absence of single storey buildings elsewhere in the streetscape and the existing single storey extension is somewhat at odds with the character of Kendall Road. However, this does not justify its removal and replacement with a larger scale, uncomplementary and bulkier building.
 11. My attention is drawn to developments elsewhere and while I have taken these into account, I have considered this proposal on its own merits. I have also had regard to Local Plan Policy 44, Bromley's Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1 and Supplementary Planning Guidance No 2 as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Guidance. However, these do not change my findings on the main issue.
 12. The proposal would provide some natural surveillance and the appellant explains that new sustainable and salvaged materials would be incorporated into the design. Natural ventilation is proposed, the windows would also allow for improved energy performance and unseen photovoltaic panels could be placed on the flat roof. While these matters carry some weight in favour of the development proposal, they do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
 13. I accept the proposal would improve the floorspace for a growing family and changed family circumstances, an increased need to work from home and would provide some economic benefits through the provision of temporary construction work. However, these benefits do not outweigh the harm identified above. I also note the support of neighbouring residents. However, this does not alter my overall findings.

14. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the Local Plan which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, the appeal is dismissed.

N Praine

INSPECTOR