



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 DECEMBER 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/22/3299874

30 The Covert, Petts Wood, Orpington BR6 0PU

- 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 Matthew Salter against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/21/05678/FULL6, dated 8 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is side two storey extension.
-

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 Covert Conservation Area (CCA) and the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

Reasons

3. There is a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
4. The Covert comprises detached and semi-detached houses of similar but varied appearance, on spacious plots, surrounded by trees and greenery. The regular spacing between buildings contributes to the openness and spacious feel of the area. The original symmetry between the pairs of semi-detached houses remains largely intact, with front roof lines and building lines appearing untouched by roof alterations and extensions. These features all form part of the significance of the CCA and ASRC.
5. No.30 is part of a pair of semi-detached houses. Although adjoining No.28 has what appears to be an internally linked annex to the side, which projects slightly forward of the principal elevation of the main house, it reads as a separate single storey pitched roof building. It retains the original roof line, the corner porch feature, and a large area of space to the side. The neighbouring pair of semi-detached houses, Nos. 32 and 34, are also identical to the appeal property.
6. The proposed extension would be constructed in matching materials, it would be subordinate in scale and, for the most part, it would replicate the roof form

- of the original dwelling. It would retain a one metre gap from the boundary, although wider spaces are more characteristic of this area.
7. I acknowledge that small front dormers can be seen on the pair of semi-detached houses opposite the appeal site and on detached houses further down the street, above integral garages. However, these other examples appear to be original features, which do not detract from the symmetry of a pair of houses.
 8. The existing corner porch, which is open on two-sides and supported by timber beams, is an original architectural feature of the houses in this area. This and the small understairs window would be enclosed by the new flat roof porch, which would project almost in line with the two-storey front gable. The garage would also project forward in line with the two-storey gable and would have a hipped roof. The garage door and eaves would be higher than the other ground floor windows, doors and porch. The loss of original features and the introduction of these new features would harmfully detract from the original architectural style and symmetry of the dwelling and of the matching dwellings on either side of the property.
 9. Accordingly, whilst I agree that the development would not appear cramped and that the small, hipped roof dormers would not be out of character with the area, the loss of original features, symmetry and the reduction of space between the matching pairs of semi-detached houses, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the CCA and ASRC.
 10. The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CCA. Nevertheless, in accordance with paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), great weight must be given to the conservation of the heritage asset. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development would 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. No public benefits have been put to me that would outweigh the harm I have identified.
 11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be contrary to Policies 6, 8, 37 and 41 of the London Borough of Bromley Local Plan (January 2019), which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development in conservation areas respects or complements the layout, scale and form of existing buildings and spaces. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework, in so far as it relates to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR