



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2024 by N Manley BA (Hons)

Decision by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 MAY 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/23/3332585

19 Westfield Road, Beckenham BR3 4EU

- 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 Sujatha Tadiparthi and Kiran Kalidindi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/23/02438/FULL6, dated 26 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as "Hip to gable roof alterations to form loft conversion, new rooflights to front, side and roof. New windows to rear and second floor flank elevations."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the Hip to gable roof alterations to form loft conversion, new rooflights to front, side and roof. New windows to rear and second floor flank elevations at 19 Westfield Road, Beckenham BR3 4EU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/23/02438/FULL6, dated 26 June 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 19 WR P 11, Rev. A; 19 WR P 12, Rev. A; 19 WR P 13 Rev. B; 19 WR P 14, Rev. B; 19 WR P 15, Rev. B; 19 WR P 16, Rev. B; 19 WR P 17, Rev. B; 19 WR P 18, Rev. B; 19 WR P 19, Rev. A and 19 WR P 20, Rev. A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the windows on the second-floor flank elevations have been fitted with obscured glazing to a minimum of Pilkington privacy level 3. These windows shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed. Once installed, the obscured glazing and non-opening elements shall be retained thereafter.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published a revision of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2023. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Westfield Road is a suburban residential road predominantly characterised by semi-detached properties with pitched roofs and gable features, set back from a tree lined highway. The appeal site, no 19 Westfield Road (no 19), is a two-storey detached property which lies at the western end of the street's south side. While it shares the gable features of the other houses along the road, it features a hipped roof style.
6. The proposal would see a double hip to gable loft conversion, alongside roof lights to the front and side and a Juliet balcony to the rear. Whilst the ridge height would remain similar to that of the neighbouring properties and a previously allowed planning consent¹, it would result in replacing the existing hipped garden facing rear elevation with a gable-styled appearance to accommodate additional bedroom space for the property's occupiers.
7. Whilst the proposed gable architectural style would change the existing rear roof style, the ridge height would remain the same as the previously approved scheme. Additionally, the proposal includes finishing the gable in matching materials, which would help the development harmonise with the host property. Moreover, the side roof slopes would ensure that the proposal would not appear overtly bulky, or as an incongruous addition to the host property.
8. Furthermore, I do not find the proposed gable would be uncharacteristic to the area. Upon observing the rear facades of neighbouring properties along Westfield Road, it is evident that no 19 possesses a differing original roof style distinct from its immediate neighbours, with noticeable modifications to the original rear rooflines of some of these neighbouring properties. Although there are no immediately visible gables to the rear of these Westfield Road houses, they are a noticeable architectural feature on the front elevations and additionally on the rear portions of adjacent properties along Hayne Road and Cedars Road. When viewed within this context, I find the proposal would not result in visual harm to the character of the host property or the surrounding area.
9. The Council has raised no concerns with regards to any other aspects of the design and I have no reason to disagree. The proposed hip to gable roof form

¹ 22/04819/FULL6

would harmonise with the predominant ridgelines seen in the street and the fenestration would be compatible with the host dwelling.

10. Given the above, the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area and would therefore not conflict with Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (Adopted January 2019). In particular, these policies seek to ensure that development should respect or compliment the scale, form and materials and the host dwelling and adjacent buildings and also be compatible with the development in the surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to all the representations made on the proposal. Various objections were raised by stakeholders, covering issues such as the property's size and design from previous extensions, potential harmful effects on neighbouring living conditions, and the proximity of the site to a nearby Conservation Area.
12. A degree of overlooking in residential areas, such as this, is not unusual from upper floor windows. In this context, the proposed rear second floor window would not lead to a significant increase in overlooking from the existing situation. Moreover, side flank windows could be conditioned to be obscure glazed to prevent more direct overlooking. There is no substantive evidence that the proposal would result in significant levels of overshadowing, loss of light or noise and disturbance. Moreover, any noise and disturbance during construction would be for a temporary period only.
13. Given my findings in the main issue I do not consider that the proposal would appear overbearing or harm the setting of the Conservation Area.
14. The number of, or reasons for, the applications made at the site is not a matter for my consideration. I have considered the appeal proposal based on the plans before the Council and have considered the scheme on its own merits.

Conditions

15. I have adapted the Council's suggested conditions where necessary in the interests of precision and brevity. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings and to require that the development is carried out in accordance with them as this provides certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is attached to require that external materials match those to be used at the existing building.
16. A condition requiring obscure glazing and limiting the opening of the side windows is necessary in the interests of preventing overlooking and ensuring privacy is maintained between no 19 and neighbouring properties.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR