



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 November 2022

by Emma Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/W/22/3303392

13 Kings Hall Road, Beckenham BR3 1LT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr W Morgan against London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref 21/05477/FULL6, is dated 19 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a proposed half hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer including front and side rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for a proposed half hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer including front and side rooflights at 13 Kings Hall Road, Beckenham BR3 1LT is refused.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council failed to determine the application within the prescribed period. However, following the submission of the appeal, the Council have prepared a Statement of Case. This sets out that had the Council determined the application, planning permission would have been refused and gives a putative reason for refusal which relates to the main issue set out below.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Aldersmead Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an attractive three storey semi-detached dwelling of a traditional design located in a predominantly residential area. It is one of a pair of dwellings that sit at the end of a short row of semi-detached properties, at the junction of Kings Hall Road and Reddons Road. Whilst the dwellings in the row have been subject to rear and side extensions, they remain consistent in their overall form and appearance, despite a degree of variation in the external finishes and detailing. In addition, the properties are set back a similar distance from the road, which also contributes to the pleasant sense of uniformity.
5. The design of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at 15 Kings Hall Road differs slightly in that its entrance door is to the side elevation fronting Reddons Road. It also has a dormer to the roof slope fronting Reddons Road, although due to the scale and hipped design, the dormer closely reflects the shape of the

main roof of the property. The appearance of the roof is therefore not dissimilar to that of the other properties in the row.

6. The site lies within the Aldersmead Road Conservation Area (the CA). The significance of the CA derives from the traditional style and form of the Whiffen houses, which are set within rows and display a marked degree of visual uniformity. The appeal property is very similar in form and appearance to others on this section of Kings Hall Road and so in these regards it makes a positive contribution to the qualities of the CA.
7. In order to convert the loft a hip to gable extension is proposed. The scale of which would fundamentally alter the shape and form of the roof and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Furthermore, the addition would be a discordant feature, which would disrupt the rhythm of the existing unaltered roof scape of the properties in this part of the street scape. The resulting significant adverse effect on the host dwelling and the character and appearance of the row would be readily visible from Kings Hall Road.
8. The dwellings in the row have similar small rear dormers, which reflect their uniformity in form and appearance. The proposal would replace the dormer at the host dwelling with a larger flat roof dormer. By virtue of its scale, bulk and design, the proposed rear dormer would be a visually dominant feature to the roof of the host dwelling which would be at odds with the form of the roofscape to the rear of the properties. Furthermore, the proposed dormer would be apparent in views of the rear of the property from Reddons Road, from where it would be seen as a prominent and discordant feature.
9. As a result, the proposed side roof extension and rear dormer would harm the appearance of the dwelling and the semi-detached pair of which it forms a part and would cause harm to the street scene and the significance and special interest of the CA.
10. The proposal would include the replacement of the existing concrete roof tiles with composite slate which is a traditional feature of the area and would reflect the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. The proposed dormer would also be constructed in matching slate. However, this would not outweigh the harm which I have identified.
11. The proposal would only affect a small part of the CA and would therefore cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. Nevertheless, substantial weight is to be attached to the harm that would arise. In accordance with advice in the Framework, where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The submissions highlight no particular public benefits to the proposal that would outweigh the harm.
12. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the CA. Accordingly, it would conflict with the design aims of Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan adopted January 2019 (the BLP) which require the scale and form of extensions to complement the host dwelling and be compatible with the development in the surrounding area and positively contribute to the existing street scene. It would also fail to accord with Policy 41 of the BLP which sets out that new development within a conservation area will need to preserve and enhance its characteristics, including respecting or

complementing the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings. The proposal would also conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan in so far as it requires that development affecting heritage assets, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. It would also fail to reflect the advice in the Aldersmead Road Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Guidance which, among other things, seeks to safeguard the visual unity of the roofs in the area.

Other Matters

13. My attention is drawn to a number of other roof alterations in the area. The extension at 25 Kings Hall Road (No 25) reflects that of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at 27 Kings Hall Road (No 27). There is also a dormer extension to the side elevation of the neighbouring property at 23 Kings Hall Road, which adds to the variation of roof shapes in the immediate context of the property. Furthermore, whilst the rear dormers to No 25 and No 27 are visible from Reddons Road, the dwellings are set in a less prominent position in the row, sited further from the junction than the appeal property. As such the additions are less visually perceptible in the street scene when viewed from Reddons Road, whereas the appeal proposal would be more clearly visible.
14. The hip to gable extension at 34 Kings Hall Road also reflects that of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, there are also a range of roof types to the dwellings in this part of the street. The roof extension underway at 28 Aldersmead Road includes a hipped dormer extension which maintains the hipped roof to the dwelling. Moreover, the street scene includes a greater degree of variation with different house types, resulting in less uniformity, and includes a similar side dormer roof extension nearby.
15. As such the circumstances in each proposal are different, and in any event the fact that apparently similar roof extensions may have been permitted is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
16. I note the appellants' comments regarding the behaviour of the Council however, this issue is not determinative to my decision. Whilst the occupants of the neighbouring properties support the proposal, the absence of any objection does not in itself render the scheme acceptable.

Conclusion

17. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan when read as a whole. There is no sound justification to grant planning permission contrary to the development plan. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Emma Worley

INSPECTOR