



BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Rosalind Upperton
Rosalind.Upperton@bromley.gov.uk

THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4745
FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 25 July 2017

To: Members of the
PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Charles Joel (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Douglas Auld, Katy Boughey, Kevin Brooks, Alan Collins, Robert Evans,
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Terence Nathan and Tony Owen

A meeting of the Plans Sub-Committee No. 1 will be held at Bromley Civic Centre on
THURSDAY 3 AUGUST 2017 AT 7.00 PM

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

Members of the public can speak at Plans Sub-Committee meetings on planning reports, contravention reports or tree preservation orders. To do so, you must have

- already written to the Council expressing your view on the particular matter, and
- indicated your wish to speak by contacting the Democratic Services team by no later than 10.00am on the working day before the date of the meeting.

These public contributions will be at the discretion of the Chairman. They will normally be limited to two speakers per proposal (one for and one against), each with three minutes to put their view across.

To register to speak please telephone Democratic Services on 020 8313 4745

If you have further enquiries or need further information on the content of any of the applications being considered at this meeting, please contact our Planning Division on 020 8313 4956 or e-mail planning@bromley.gov.uk

Information on the outline decisions taken will usually be available on our website (see below) within a day of the meeting.

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

A G E N D A

- 1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
- 2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 13 JUNE 2017**
(Pages 1 - 6)
- 4 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

SECTION 1

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
4.1	Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom Conservation Area	7 - 12	(17/01427/FULL1) - Chelsfield Primary School, Warren Road, Orpington, BR6 6EP
4.2	Petts Wood and Knoll	13 - 18	(17/01433/FULL1) - Willett Recreation Ground, Crossway, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1PE

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
4.3	West Wickham	19 - 26	(17/00256/FULL6) - 124 Copse Avenue, West Wickham, BR4 9NP
4.4	Darwin		(17/00655/FULL1) - Archies Stables, Cudham Lane North, Sevenoaks, TN14 7QT (REPORT TO FOLLOW)
4.5	Bickley	27 - 40	(17/01241/FULL1) - 42 Orchard Road Bromley BR1 2PS
4.6	Copers Cope Conservation Area	41 - 58	(17/01955/FULL1) - 61 The Avenue, Beckenham, BR3 5EE.
4.7	Chislehurst	59 - 64	(17/01968/FULL6) - 11 Gravelwood Close, Chislehurst, BR7 6JT

4.8	Kelsey and Eden Park	65 - 76	(17/02002/FULL1) - 21 Langley Road, Beckenham BR3 4AE
4.9	Bromley Common and Keston	77 - 86	(17/02203/FULL1) - Land at Chantry Lane, Bromley, BR2 9RZ.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
4.10	Bromley Town	87 - 100	(17/02290/OUT) - 100 Madeira Avenue, Bromley, BR1 4AS
4.11	Chislehurst Conservation Area	101 - 106	(17/02538/FULL6) - 41 Heathfield, Chislehurst, BR7 6AF

SECTION 4

(Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
4.12	Hayes and Coney Hall	107 - 112	(16/05756/FULL6) - 47 Hayes Wood Avenue, Hayes, Bromley, BR2 7BG
4.13	Hayes and Coney Hall	113 - 118	(17/00675/FULL6) - 47 Hayes Wood Avenue, Hayes, Bromley, BR2 7BG
4.14	Copers Cope Conservation Area	119 - 122	(17/01568/ADV) - 162 High Street Beckenham, BR3 1EW
4.15	Copers Cope Conservation Area	123 - 128	(17/01723/FULL1) - 162 High Street Beckenham, BR3 1EW
4.16	Hayes and Coney Hall	129 - 134	(17/02580/FULL6) - 35 Hayes Wood Avenue, Hayes, Bromley, BR2 7BG

5 CONTRAVENTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
	NO REPORTS		

6 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
	NO REPORTS		

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 13 June 2017

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Charles Joel (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Douglas Auld, Katy Boughey, Kevin Brooks,
Alan Collins, Robert Evans, Samaris Huntington-Thresher,
Russell Mellor and Terence Nathan

Also Present:

Councillors Michael Tickner

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Tony Owen and Councillor Russell Mellor attended as his substitute.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest reported.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 13 APRIL 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 April be confirmed.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

4.1 BROMLEY COMMON AND KESTON CONSERVATION AREA

(17/00542/FULL1) - 12 Barnet Wood Road, Hayes, Bromley

Description of application – Part one/two storey rear extension with rear rooflight and elevational alterations to front and side.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

4.2
COPERS COPE
CONSERVATION AREA

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

(17/00812/FULL1) - 24 Downs Hill, Beckenham, BR3 5HB

Description of application – Demolition of host dwelling and erection of new detached house.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor Michael Tickner in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

Councillor Tickner had visited the site and in his view the proposed development was a three storey development of poor design with inadequate separation and excessive bulk that would dwarf Numbers 26 and 20 and the twin gables were out of keeping with the conservation area contrary to Policies BE1 and BE11 Unitary Development Plan. No provision for a garage had been made and off-site parking was inadequate and he referred to the loss of residential amenity and privacy and drew Member's attention to the objections raised by The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas.

Supplementary information and photographs had been received from the objector and circulated to Members. The Chief Planner's representative reminded Members that Highways Division had raised no objection to the application.

Ward Member Councillor Mellor supported Councillor Tickner's representations and objected to the application.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1. The proposed development by reason of its excessive massing and design would constitute an overbearing and dominant form of development, failing to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would be detrimental to the amenities that neighbouring

properties could reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy contrary to Policies BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan, adopted SPG1 and SPG2, Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan, the London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

4.3 CRAY VALLEY EAST

(17/01380/FULL6) - 14 Okemore Gardens, Orpington, BR5 3PJ

Description of application – Part one/two side/rear extension.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

4.4 CLOCK HOUSE

(17/01744/FULL6) - 13 Blakeney Avenue, Beckenham, BR3 1HH

Description of application - Part conversion of garage, single storey rear extension and rear dormer extensions to form habitable accommodation in the roofspace.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with two further conditions to read:-

“4. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no buildings, structures, alterations, walls or fences of any kind shall be erected or made within the curtilage(s) of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to prevent an overdevelopment of the site and to enable the Council to consider all further development in compliance with Policy BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

5. The additional accommodation hereby approved shall be used only by members of the household occupying the dwelling at 13 Blakeney Avenue; and shall not be severed to form a separate self-contained unit.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy H8 of the Unitary Development Plan, to ensure that the accommodation is not used separately and unassociated with the main dwelling and so as to prevent an unsatisfactory sub-division into two dwellings.”

**4.5
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(17/01791/FULL6) - 27 West Way, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1LN

Description of application – Single storey side extension and conversion of garage to habitable room (amendment to previously approved application with reference 16/02838/FULL6).

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that no objections to the application had been received. Supplementary information had been received from the applicant and circulated to Members.

Members having considered the report and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with the removal of the Informative and an additional condition to read:-

“6. The proposed single storey side extension certified as lawful under reference 15/00817/PLUD shall only be constructed before any of the development hereby granted planning permission is commenced

REASON: To ensure that development is built fully in accordance with the General Permitted Development Order, 2015 and that no unauthorised building operations occur on site.”

SECTION 4

(Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

**4.6
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

(17/01047/FULL6) - 106 Birch Tree Avenue, West Wickham, BR4 9EL

Description of application – Alterations to existing side dormer (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION).

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED**, without prejudice to any future consideration, **TO APPEAR ON LIST 2 ON THE AGENDA OF A FUTURE PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE AND TO REQUEST AMENDMENTS TO THE DORMER TO INCLUDE TILE HANGING AS THE FACING MATERIAL.**

**4.7
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(17/01588/OUT) - 24 Keswick Road, Orpington BR6 0EU

Description of application - Demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage at rear, and erection of 2 two storey 4 bedroom semi-detached dwellings with accommodation in roofspace, associated accesses and 4 car parking spaces (Outline).

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Photographs from the objector had been received and circulated to Members. It was reported that on page 83 of the Chief Planner's report the last sentence under the paragraph headed, 'Impact on trees' was amended to read, "The proposals are therefore considered to be harmful to the adjacent protected tree."

Ward Member, Councillor Douglas Auld, had visited the site and concurred with the planning report that if the proposed development were to be built it would be two to two and a half storeys tall, would have serious consequences in terms of daylight and outlook for the occupants of 22 Keswick Road and extend 6.3 metres beyond the rear wall of that property. Having taken into account the reduction in size and the open aspects of the surrounding area the layout of the proposed development would still remain cramped.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reason set out in the report of the Chief Planner with a further reason to read:-

REASON 2: The proposed semi-detached dwellings, by reason of their proximity to the side boundary would constitute a cramped overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the street scene and the character of the area in general and contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan, adopted SPG1 and SPG2, Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan, the London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Meeting ended at 8.10 pm

Chairman

SECTION '1' – Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley

Application No : 17/01427/FULL1

Ward:
Chelsfield And Pratts
Bottom

Address : Chelsfield Primary School Warren Road
Orpington BR6 6EP

OS Grid Ref: E: 548238 N: 164217

Applicant : Mrs Michaela Foley

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey extension to annexe building with access ramp and change to site boundary

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Chelsfield
Areas of Archeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Green Belt
London City Airport Safeguarding

Proposal

It is proposed to add a single storey rear extension to an annexe building located within the northern corner of the site which would measure 6m in width and 5m in depth, and would be used as an essential learning area.

Access to the extension would be via the existing covered walkway adjacent to the north-western boundary, and a ramped access would be added.

In order to facilitate the extension, a small area of adjacent land at the Rectory measuring 5.66m x 1.7m would be included within the site, thus extending the site boundary.

Location

Chelsfield Primary School lies on the north-eastern side of Warren Road, close to the junction with Church Road. It is situated within Chelsfield Conservation Area, and lies within the Green Belt.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- trees have already been lost in spite of the Conservation Area designation which would make the proposed development more visible from Orlestone Gardens
- increased noise disturbance to neighbouring properties from the use of the building
- detrimental impact on Chelsfield Conservation Area
- proposals are larger than the previous extension permitted
- there would be no room for replacement tree screening.

Comments from Consultees

Highways - There would be no increase in pupil or staff numbers as a result of the proposals, and they would not impact on the access or parking arrangements, therefore no highways objections are raised.

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
 BE10 Locally Listed Buildings
 BE11 Conservation Areas
 G1 The Green Belt

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the draft Local Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State in mid-2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances. The relevant policies are as follows:

Draft Policy 37 - General Design of Development
 Draft Policy 41 - Conservation Areas
 Draft Policy 49 - Green Belt

Planning History

Permission was granted in November 2014 (ref.14/03336) for a single storey side/rear extension to the annexe building which was greater in width, but not as deep as the current proposals. This has not yet been implemented.

Most recently planning permission was granted under ref. 16/05292 for a single storey front extension to create lobby entrance.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the open character and visual amenities of the Green Belt, on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the Locally Listed building on the site, on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties and on trees within the site.

Green Belt

In accordance with the NPPF, inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt and very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

The proposed extension to the annexe would result in around 27.3 sqm of additional floorspace to the building, which in the context of the relatively modest size of the host building would not be considered to represent a proportionate addition as could be allowed as an exception to inappropriate development under NPPF paragraph 89. The proposal is therefore considered to constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Whilst the additional built development proposed at the site would result in some harm to openness, this would result in a limited impact given its siting to the north-east of the annexe and adjacent to neighbouring dwellings in Orlestone Gardens.

The applicant has sought to justify the proposal in the design and access statement submitted with the application, which refers to the modest size of the extension and states that there is an urgent need for space for accommodating small groups for assisted learning including special educational support. UDP Policy C7 supports educational extensions where there is a need for improved facilities, and it is considered that, subject to an overall assessment of the development including any other harm, this would represent a significant material consideration in the overall planning balance and could result in very special circumstances. It is also noted that planning permission has previously been granted for a similar extension in this location, with a greater overall width but a lesser depth. This has not been implemented to date.

Impact on the Conservation Area and Locally Listed Building

UDP Policy BE11 requires development proposals in Conservation Areas to preserve or enhance their character and appearance. The extension would be flat roofed and timber clad to match the existing annexe and sited in a relatively discreet location to the north-east of the existing annexe and away from the main school building which is Locally Listed. It is therefore considered that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved, and that the setting of the Locally Listed main school building would not be unduly impacted upon as a result of the development proposed.

Neighbouring Amenity

With regard to the impact on neighbouring properties, the extension would be set back 1.7m from the boundary with No.5 Orlestone Gardens, and would lie adjacent to its garage. It would also lie adjacent to the garage at No.6, and given its modest size, the proposals are not, therefore, considered to be harmful to the amenities of adjacent residential properties.

Trees

With regard to trees on the site, there are nearby cypress and ash apples which are protected as a result of the Conservation Area designation. The foundations of the proposed extension would be formed of piers, and would not be invasive to nearby tree roots. It is therefore considered that the proposed works would not be significantly harmful to the screening between the school and the neighbouring properties, but it is suggested that the planting of evergreen trees and shrubs along the boundary would help to improve screening to neighbouring properties, as part of a scheme of landscaping to be secured by condition.

It is noted that clearance works have already taken place at the site including the removal of a tree which was located around 0.75m from the north-east elevation of the proposed building, and which benefited from protection as a result of the Conservation Area designation which affects the land. Were this tree still standing on site it would be necessary to consider whether its removal would be required to facilitate the proposed development, and if so whether the public amenity value of the tree and its contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would have been sufficient to withhold planning permission.

The Council's Tree Officer has visited the site and confirmed that the removal of this tree would have been required to facilitate the construction now proposed, but that based on photographic evidence of the tree prior to its removal, it is unlikely that its retention would have been requested having regard to the Conservation Area and visual amenities. In this case appropriate mitigation is now proposed in the form of additional evergreen trees and shrubs along the boundary, with details to be secured by condition.

Overall conclusion

It is considered that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and result in harm to openness. In respect of any other harm, the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of the locally listed building, and would not impact detrimentally on the amenities of neighbouring residents. Any harm caused as a result of tree removal can be mitigated through a scheme of replanting to be secured by condition. The applicant has stated that there is an urgent need for additional space to accommodate small groups for assisted learning, including special educational support. In this instance, it is considered that this consideration would clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, as well as any other harm identified, resulting in very special circumstances.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Details of a scheme of landscaping, which shall include new tree screening near to the north-east boundary of the site and the materials of paved areas and other hard surfaces, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The approved scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following the first occupation of the buildings or the substantial completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the substantial completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally planted.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan, to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development, and to provide screening to neighbouring residential properties.

- 3 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and / or drawings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: 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.

- 4 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.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

This page is left intentionally blank

SECTION '1' – Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley

Application No : 17/01433/FULL1

Ward:
Petts Wood And Knoll

Address : Willett Recreation Ground Crossway
Petts Wood Orpington BR5 1PE

OS Grid Ref: E: 544666 N: 168010

Applicant : Mrs K Barritt

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey detached timber building for storage and extension to existing 2 metre high palisade fence

Key designations:

Area of Special Residential Character
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 4
Urban Open Space

Proposal

The application is accessed from the western side of Crossway and forms part of the Willett Recreation Ground site.

The proposal seeks permission for a single storey detached timber building for storage and extension to existing 2 metre high palisade fence.

Amended plans were received on 19th May 2017. The plans were amended as follows:

- Rotate the shed/hut 180 degrees so that the entrance is facing the existing building.
- Reduce the length of the path significantly so that it only goes up to the proposed gate in the palisade.
- Move the storage/hut facility forward towards the existing building so that the new fence would be brought forward by 750mm.
- We would maintain the 500m access around the shed/hut to allow us to maintain the grassed area.

The proposed storage hut will measure 3.66m in length, 3m in width, and have an eaves height of 2m and an overall height to the pitch of the roof of 2.65m.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- I fully support the Petts Wood Runners and their use of the Rec. but have following concerns:
- The size of the footprint of the proposed shed / fence / path;
- The extreme 'boginess' of the area in wet periods;
- The restriction presented to the contractors accessing the area beyond the proposed structure;
- The need to exhaustively explore any existing under-utilised storage areas in the pavilion;
- The principle of giving up public use green space to an individual group;
- Firstly Willett Recreation ground is very small compared to most in the area. It already has 6 tennis courts, a childrens' play area, a bowling green, a cricket club and a pre-school. This is all in a relatively small space with the corresponding need for parking/access;
- The area for people to walk or children to play is restricted by the cricket club having a large area in the middle roped off for the whole of the year. This must (I presume) be with the council's approval but should in my opinion just be in operation in the cricket season;
- The access to the recreation park is tiny, just a small drive into it just about a little larger than the width of a car. It can, and I speak from experience, be quite daunting when walking through with a car entering or leaving. When the running club meet the surrounding roads are full of parked cars. Presumably there will be more and more cars from the members. The car park in the rec is small and reflects the reasonable use of the park;
- The pavilion is quite large, It is used by the pre-school in term time only and the cricket club and the bowling club in the summer only. Surely there must be way that the running club can share some of these premises. For many months of the year they are unused;
- There are other more suitable sites in the area. Poverest Road recreation ground is much larger and has adequate parking and, indeed , much more room to run, which is presumably the point of the club;
- I oppose it because it is taking public, green parkland to build a storage facility that will only be used by a few;
- The erection of more palisade fencing and another shed in this area would create an eyesore;
- The park is there for the use of all- not to erect storage facilities. this would be a mis-use of open space;
- This is Public Open Space;
- Alternative options must be considered like the free space in the Pavilion and ancillary building which are available;
- This will set a precedent to any other club/association requesting a shed/building. How many clubs can you have?
- This outside the UDP recommendations for public open space and a clear disregard for an area of special character;
- Overbuilt/out of keeping;

- Security and safety disregard;
- Although there is already a metal fence in position around the bowling facilities, erecting an additional metal fence is not in keeping with park landscaping and my view is that access to any facilities should be through existing access points i.e. through the pavilion or bowling facilities.

Representations of support have also been received, which can be summarised as follows:

- Petts Wood Running (PWR) Club are a valuable community group;
- PWR has grown in the 10 year existence of the club and now requires a large amount of equipment to safely stage events;
- The proposed storage shed is significantly smaller than surrounding buildings, including those used by the cricket and bowls clubs;
- Proposed location would not affect users of the Willet Rec grounds as a recreation amenity for the public;
- Having the club use the recreation ground provides the local residents with additional security as it helps to deter vandals.
- I am a Petts Wood Runner. The club has almost doubled in size to 500 since I joined just two years ago. The club's members are primarily local people aged between 30-70 exercising within a supportive community to help achieve a healthy balance in their lives. The growth of the club requires that some infrastructure be put in place to help it function safely. In this case some storage is essential for the organisation and safety equipment in the location where the club's runs begin and end. On a typical Tuesday evening run we have 100-120 participants. The participants need to gather quietly in a public space and it benefits the club and the community if the necessary equipment is to hand.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies:

National Planning Policy Framework:

Chapter 7- Requiring Good Design

London Plan:

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.6 Architecture

Unitary Development Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development

H8 Residential Extensions

H10 Areas of Special Residential Character

G8 Urban Open Space

SPG1 General Design Guidance

SPG2 Residential Design Guidance

According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF, decision takers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given.

As set out in paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework, emerging plans gain weight as they move through the plan making process.

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. A period of consultation on the proposed draft Local Plan (under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended) ran from November 2016 and closed on December 31st 2016. It is anticipated that the draft Local Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State in 2017.

Draft policies of relevance to the application comprise:

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions
Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development
Draft Policy 44 Areas of Special Residential Character

History

There are a number of historical planning approvals on the wider application site, relating to mixed-use of the sports pavilion to include pre-school use, floodlighting to the tennis courts, temporary changing rooms and toilets, replacement building for sports pavilion, and a single storey detached building for a changing room.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the Urban Open Space where Policy G8 applies and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

The application site was visited by the case officer and the aims and objectives of the above policies, national and regional planning guidance, all other material planning considerations including any objections, other representations and relevant planning history on the site were taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

The proposed storage building is to be located at the northern end of the Urban Open Space and to the west of the existing pavilion building. The structure and extended fencing will be in close proximity to the existing pavilion. The proposal is small scale and supports the continued outdoor recreational use of the land. The siting, height and scale of the structure is sympathetic and does not detract from

the open character of the area. Indeed, the structure will not be visible from the car park nor from the majority of the wider recreation ground as it will be located close to the existing buildings.

It is proposed to use the structure as a storage unit for collapsible tables, chairs, banners, barriers, signage boards etc for when the Petts Wood Running Club are holding events to raise monies for charities. No neighbouring residential properties are considered to be significantly affected as the nearest dwellings are approx. 40m away to the north.

The proposal is considered to comply with Policy G8 as the use of the new structure will be related to the existing use; it is small scale and supports the outdoor recreational use of the site, and does not unduly impair the open nature of the site.

Concerns have been raised by local residents stating that if all of the clubs that utilise the recreation ground were to erect permanent storage structures, then there would be no open recreation ground left to use, however each case should be taken on its own merit and dealt with at the time of application. The current application, for the reasons cited above, is considered acceptable and unlikely to harm the visual or residential amenities of neighbouring properties or the urban open space designation of the site.

Having had regard to the above it is considered that the siting, size and design of the proposed extension is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area and Urban Open Space designation of the site.

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION
as amended by documents received on 19.05.2017**

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Details of the materials and colour to be used for the external surfaces of the structure hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policies BE1 and G8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

- 3 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.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/00256/FULL6

Ward:
West Wickham

Address : 124 Copse Avenue West Wickham BR4
9NP

OS Grid Ref: E: 537796 N: 164877

Applicant : Mrs Angela Walters

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part 1/2 storey front/side/rear extensions to include elevational alterations. Roof alterations to form habitable space incorporating side dormers and rooflight.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 51

UPDATE

This application was deferred by Members at Plans Sub Committee 3 on 9th May 2017 to seek amendments to the roof designs to lessen the impact of the extensions to the neighbours at No.122.

Following the deferral of the application on the 9th May the agent submitted revised drawings on 15th June 2017. The main changes comprise the following:-

- The dormer window to the left hand flank elevation has been redesigned
- The right hand corner at first floor, which was previously shown to be an en-suite bathroom, has been completely removed.
- The accommodation in the roof space and roof has been redesigned.

The report has been updated to reflect the revised drawings submitted.

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part one/part two front/side and rear extension and elevational alterations. Roof alterations to form habitable space incorporating side dormer window and roof lights.

The application is a resubmission of a similar planning application (ref: 16/03991) refused on 27th October 2016. The current application is accompanied by a Design & Access Statement.

The application site is a detached corner property located on the western side of Copse Avenue on the corner with Inchwood & Woodland Way, West Wickham.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

Updated neighbour comments

Whilst we appreciate that a slight alteration has been made to the drawings considered at the Planning Sub Committee on 9th May 2017, the proposed development remains largely unchanged. It still represents an unacceptable impact upon our visual and residential amenities by reason of its bulk, scale and depth, contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

In the spirit of compromise, we would accept the proposed development with the following changes:

1. If the roofline remained with hips and valleys to our side then we would see this as an acceptable outcome.

The Councillors at the Planning Meeting sought amendments to the roof design.

The revised plans for the roof haven't properly addressed the concerns raised and the roof still remains mainly flat, not only is this contravening SPG2, but this would also have a big impact on our right to light in our property. In addition, the double-sized velux windows on our side would affect our privacy.

2. If the rear extension was to come out no further than the existing line of the property we would see this as an acceptable outcome. This would then limit the reduction to our right to light and would improve the visual impact of a blank flank wall, retaining our views of the woods.

The Councillors at the Planning Meeting sought changes to lessen the impact of the extension on 122 Copse Avenue.

As the plans stand, the proposed garden room extension to the back of the house would extend beyond the rear level of all neighbouring properties. At the Planning Sub Committee meeting on 9th May 2017, one of councillors expressed concern about the scale of the development which he termed as a "wrap around" and this matter has not been addressed by the latest set of plans.

We would welcome visits from members of the Planning Sub Committee so that our objections can be fully appreciated.

Original neighbour comments

Whilst we appreciate that alterations to the original application have been made, the proposed development still represents an unacceptable impact upon our visual

and residential amenities by reason of its bulk, scale and depth, contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

We have the following specific observations to make:

1. We still consider this to be an overdevelopment and overly dominant. Whilst the garage footprint has been pared down slightly, the 1st and 2nd floors have been increased considerably. This is a very significant overdevelopment when compared to the size of the original property.

2. Whilst the proposed new plans have removed the dormers from the side facing ourselves, these have been replaced with quite dominant velux windows which will afford views straight into our property. Whereas the current roof plan includes hips and valleys allowing light into our property, the proposed roofline will be higher than the valleys [and flat] so will have a massive impact on the light entering our property at both floor levels.

3. The proposed roof plan is not in keeping with the traditional and existing pitched roof. The proposed roof is largely flat and includes a dormer at the side. We feel this would be harmful to the streetscene and character of the area.

4. The increased development at 1st floor level will further encroach on the light to our property. The size of the 1st floor development does not respect the scale and form of the original property or other properties in the surrounding area. Also the fenestration on the proposed rear elevation consists of full height doors, again having a significant impact on our privacy.

5. The garden room extension at ground floor level would extend beyond the rear level of all neighbouring properties; other neighbours have already had restrictions imposed to ensure privacy is maintained. The proposal will not only further reduce our views of the woods but we would be left looking at a blank flank wall instead. The proposed garden room will overlook our garden and our patio privacy will be severely compromised. The height of our fence is already 6' 6" from the level of our patio and to increase it further - as suggested in the planning statement - would impact further on our rights to light at our property.

When reviewing the reasons for refusal to the 2016 application [16/03991/FULL6], it appears that points 1 and 2 have not been properly addressed. We therefore request that permission for the proposed development is refused.

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) documents are also a consideration in the determination of planning applications. These are:

SPG No1 - General Design Principles
SPG No2 - Residential Design Guidance

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the draft Local Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State in mid-2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft policies of relevance to the determination of the application comprise:

Draft Policy 37 (General Design of Development)
Draft Policy 6 (Residential Extensions)

Planning History

Under planning application ref: 16/03991 planning permission was refused for elevational alterations, first floor side extension, two storey rear extension and roof alterations to incorporate roof lights and side and rear dormers.

The application was refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposed dormer windows by reason of their bulk and design, would be an over dominate feature and have a detrimental impact upon the appearance of the host building and wider street scene, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.*
- 2. The proposed bulk, design and depth of the two storey side and single storey rear extensions would be out of character with an detrimental to the appearance of the host building, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.*
- 3. The proposed two storey side extension would by reason of its height, siting and lack of adequate side space would fail to comply with the requirements of Policy H9 in respect of the provision of minimum of 1m side space for the full height and length of the development, contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.*

Under planning application reference: 95/01726 planning permission was granted for a two storey side and single storey side and rear extension.

Under planning application reference: 06/02559 planning permission was refused for a detached garden building (retrospective application). This application was also dismissed at appeal.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

Following the deferral of the application on the 9th May the agent has submitted revised drawings. The main changes comprise the following:-

- The dormer window to the left hand flank elevation has been redesigned
- The right hand corner at first floor, which was previously shown to be an en-suite bathroom, has been completely removed.
- The accommodation in the roof space and roof has been redesigned.

The rest of this report has been updated to reflect the revised drawings submitted.

Design

Policies H8, BE1 and the Council's Supplementary design guidance seek to ensure that new development, including residential extensions are of a high quality design that respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development. In addition, Policy BE1 also seeks to ensure that new development proposals, including residential extensions respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and that their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by loss of outlook or overshadowing.

Policy H9 also requires proposals of two or more storeys in height to be a minimum of 1m from the side boundary, which has been provided in this case.

Guidance contained in SGP2 (Residential Design Guidance) at paragraph 1.4 states "The majority of buildings in Bromley have traditional pitched roof forms, contributing greatly to the streetscape and roofspace of their localities. Roof alterations should be carefully considered to ensure they respect the form and appearance of the existing roof".

The property forms a detached dwelling located at the end of Copse Avenue and the corner of Inchwood. The property in its current form retains a traditional hipped roof with a garage built up to the boundary. The property has been extended to the side with planning permission being granted in 1995. The property also benefits from off street parking with a driveway for two cars. The properties along Copse Avenue are very uniform in their design, mass and materials. It is noted that several properties have been extended, mainly to the rear.

The host property has been previously extended under planning application reference:- 95/01726 for a two storey side and single storey side and rear extensions. The current proposal seeks to reconfigure the host dwelling and add additional development to the front, sides and rear of the property.

To the front elevation a new fronted bare brick gable is proposed in the middle of the property and a first floor side extension added to the property. The existing garage is to be made narrower to allow the development to comply with the Council's side space policy. The existing chimney is also to be relocated to allow for the proposed loft conversion. The first floor side extension (on the flank elevation with Inchwood) proposes three new sets of windows at first floor level and a redesigned dormer window set within the newly created roofspace. To the rear a single storey rear extension is to be added adding 3.9m in depth to the property together with a first floor rear extension and additional roof slope. The first floor side extension continues across the rear width of the property, now shown to be set in by 2.5m. Double height velux windows will be added to the roofspace.

Internally the kitchen/living/dining space to be enlarged with the main increase being the single storey element. At first floor the existing layout is to be reconfigured with one of the existing bedrooms being lost to create a library, enlarged ensuite, enlarged rear bedroom and one newly created bedroom. The loft is to be utilised to create one new bedroom, dining room, bathroom, games room and living area.

Dormer extensions are common place in the Borough however the size of the loft conversion will require the roof pitch to be raised and a despite being redesigned a sizeable dormer extension being added to the side of the property. The dormer window on the flank elevation facing Inchwood has windows (6 in total) which have a greater degree of glazing which will look out onto Spring Park.

The changes to the roof would result in changes to the host dwelling and wider street scene which on balance are considered to harm the architectural style and appearance of the host building.

The proposed first floor development is still considered an overdevelopment of the property extending 3m in depth at first floor level which will elongate the property to the sides and rear. It will mean that the property will be considered bulky and will result in an unsympathetic form of development.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would measure between 2.8m - 3.9m in depth. It is noted that the rear elevation has already been significantly modified and to add further development would make the property appear overly bulky despite only being single storey.

The proposed changes on all elevations are not considered overly sympathetic and the changes to the fenestration to the front and rear of the property in particular would be at odds with the character of the streetscene within the wider area. The increase in glazing to the rear of the property would also be a marked increase in the number of windows which currently reside the rear elevation particularly at first floor level.

Whilst it is noted that No.120 Copse Avenue has been extended at first floor level back in 2002 under planning application reference 02/02826 the development would not be as much as that proposed by No.124. Overall, the increase in the

footprint of whole of the original property in particular to the side and rear is considered bulky and an overdevelopment of the plot size.

However, Members will need to consider whether the changes submitted overcome previous concerns.

Neighbouring amenity

Policy BE1(v) of the UDP that new development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal does not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or privacy they enjoy or result in an un-neighbourly sense of enclosure. This is supported by Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

With the host dwelling being a corner property the sole impact is the neighbours at No.122 Copse Avenue. The neighbours has raised objections to several issues including; the proposal being an overdevelopment of the property; dominant velux rooflights; negative impact to the street scene in view of the changes to the roof; loss of light and privacy; the proposed development is a marked increase on what has been allowed to other properties in Copse Avenue.

With the property already being extended the neighbours at No.122 will see an increase in of 3m in depth at first floor and 2.8m at ground floor level. It is however noted that the rear first floor extension has been amended and set in by 2.5m to reduce the impact to the neighbours at No.122. Despite this change the reduction of 2.5m at first floor level and the insertion of a large obscure glazed window on the flank elevation would still have an overbearing visual impact on the neighbours.

The increased bulk and mass to the property would mean the neighbours will be faced with looking at a large obscure glazed window and a 3m deep first floor side extension. Whilst the single storey extension would be off-set from the boundary by 4.6m the total increases at ground, first and second floors would result in a loss of prospect and enclosure. The privacy of the residents of neighbours would also be impacted with the first floor rear windows creating a greater degree of overlooking and a loss of privacy to their rear patio/garden. The resultant overlooking and lack of privacy is considered to be unacceptable.

The resultant first floor extension and roof alterations/loft conversion are also considered to result in a loss of daylight and sunlight, as well as overshadowing and an unacceptable visual impact and loss of prospect, which is detrimental to the residential amenities the neighbouring property currently enjoys and contrary to policy H8 and BE1 of the UDP.

Whilst Members may consider that the changes to the dormer are now more acceptable the omission of the proposed en-suite at first floor level is not considered significant enough to overcome concerns about the development as a whole, which still represents an overdevelopment of the property and a visual impact to the residential amenities to No.122 by reason of its bulk, scale and depth, contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents and impact detrimentally on the character of the surrounding area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) DC/17/00256 & 16/03991 as set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED
as amended by documents received on 15.06.2017**

The reasons for refusal are:

The proposed bulk, design and depth of the first floor side and single storey rear extensions would be out of character with and detrimental to the appearance of the host building, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed bulk and depth of the first floor extension would mean a loss of prospect and amenity to the neighbours at No.122 Copse Avenue thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/01241/FULL1

Ward:
Bickley

Address : 42 Orchard Road Bromley BR1 2PS

OS Grid Ref: E: 541569 N: 169802

Applicant : Mr John Doyle

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 8 flats (2x3 bed, 4x2 bed and 2x1 bed) associated parking and landscaping.
Revised plans showing private amenity space with screening for ground floor units

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 10

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 8 flats (2x3 bed, 4x2 bed and 2x1 bed) associated parking and landscaping.

This is a revised scheme following a dismissed appeal.

Location

The application site currently comprises of a detached single storey dwelling set on a large and prominent corner plot on the southern side of Orchard Road and the corner of Sundridge Avenue. The land to the south of the application site, beginning along Sundridge Avenue, is defined as a conservation area. The interest of Sundridge Avenue Conservation Area lies in its completeness as a row of substantial late Victorian villas.

The existing bungalow has a relatively low profile in relation to the Sundridge Avenue street scene and the adjacent Conservation Area which arises from not only the single storey height of the dwelling but also the surrounding space within its plot together with the set-back from the Sundridge Avenue frontage: there is currently around a 12m minimum set-back between the front of the existing dwelling and Orchard Road and around 12.8m minimum set-back between the flank wall of the bungalow and Sundridge Avenue.

This spaciousness is mirrored on the opposite corner of Sundridge Avenue and Orchard Road, where there is a generous separation between No.22 and the two highway boundaries.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, although in the immediate context of the application site is a preparatory school on the opposite side of Orchard Road, and to the south in Sundridge Avenue is a care home.

Along Orchard Road the properties are varied in age, size and design, however, a significant number of them are substantial in scale, being either larger dwellings or blocks of apartments. The dwellings are also varied to the south along Sundridge Avenue.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- Loss of privacy . The view from the upper floors will look directly into neighbouring windows.
- Overshadowing from height, size and bulk. The positioning of the balconies facing neighbouring property will allow noise, smell and smoke into neighbouring windows.
- Noise from the flats, cars parking and the number of people living there will increase to such an extent that it will effect substantially quality of life.
- Will restrict views of the streetscene,
- The number of proposed flats will impact on an already busy road junction. It will add to the congestion and road safety issues caused by the volume of traffic at this junction and the additional traffic related to the school directly opposite.
- Inadequate parking.
- Where will visitors park?
- Residents will have limited amenity facilities, totally out of keeping with the area
- Design will impact upon the conservation area.
- The height and bulk of the proposed development are out of proportion to the properties alongside it on Orchard Road.
- The existing bungalow contributes to the open character of the area and as a gateway to the conservation area.
- The previously granted application consisted of up to 6 bedrooms. This application now consists of up to 16 bedrooms.
- The submission is disappointing in that it only differs from the previously refused application by the addition of a small private balconies or designated terraced area which would do little to greatly enhance the amenity space of any future residents and does nothing to address the real concerns raised by neighbours and local people against the previous application.

The above is a precis of the objections received. A copy of the full objections can be read online.

Further information was received in relation to how the terraces would be accessed and details of the privacy screening. Amended plans were received and all neighbours were reconsulted on 6th July 2017 for 14 days.

The following representations were received

- Original objection still stands. The privacy screening does nothing at all to allay concerns about noise and smoke
- The screens could easily be removed post completion and sale and would then look directly into neighbouring properties.
- The property is still too large and overbearing and the plot does not support the amount of planned properties, giving small external areas for 2 and 3 bedroom flats that are not conducive to the plot and its relationship to its neighbours
- The plans have been agreed for a family home from the current developer. We believed it was for their family home not 8 flats.

Highways officer - The development is situated on the corner of Orchard Road and Sundridge Avenue, which is accessed via both Orchard Road to the north and Sundridge Avenue to the east. Orchard Road forms a priority controlled junction with Sundridge Avenue at the north east corner of the site. Immediately opposite the site is Beaside Preparatory School; also there are school keep clear road markings in the vicinity of the school entrance on the north side of Orchard Road and a pelican crossing approximately 10 metres to the west of the site access. There are double yellow lines at the junction with Sundridge Avenue prohibiting parking at all times.

Eleven car parking spaces are indicated on the submitted plans accessed utilising the existing access arrangements. This is acceptable. Cycle parking storage is also indicated on the plan

No objection subject to conditions

Trees officer - Comments from the previous application were as follows:
The application site is largely free of mature trees and is currently landscaped with a large area of lawn and a number of flower beds, planted with occasional low level shrubs. The application site appears to be large enough to accommodate the proposed development, whilst retaining aspects of the current design/layout. As details of landscaping have not been submitted with the application, I would recommend that this is condition with any forthcoming planning permission.

Drainage - no objections subject to conditions

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
BE13 Development Adjacent to a Conservation Area
H1 Housing Supply
H7 Housing Density and Design
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space
NE7 Development and Trees
T3 Parking
T7 Cyclists
T18 Road Safety

SPG: Sundridge Avenue Conservation Area
SPG1 General Design Principles
SPG2 Residential Design Guidance

London Plan:

3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments
5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
5.13 Sustainable Drainage
6.9 Cycling
6.13 Parking
7.2 An Inclusive Environment
7.3 Designing out crime
7.4 Local Character
7.6 Architecture
Mayor of London's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016

The NPPF 2012

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the draft Local Plan will be to the Secretary of State in mid 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Relevant policies:

Draft Policy 1 Housing Supply
Draft Policy 4 Housing Design
Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions
Draft Policy 30 Parking
Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development
Draft Policy 73 Development and Trees

Planning History

Planning permission was refused for the demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of 2 detached two storey dwellings including detached single storey garage to rear under planning ref.12/04009. The application was subsequently dismissed at appeal. In his report, the appeal Inspector concluded that the house at plot 1 adjacent to Sundridge Avenue would erode the open character of this corner harmful to the setting of the Sundridge Avenue Conservation Area.

A revised application for 2 two storey detached dwellings was also refused by the Council, under planning ref.13/01074 and subsequently dismissed at Appeal in a decision dated 28th Nov. 2013. The inspector considered that the proposal was insufficient to "address the previous Inspector's fundamental concerns over the introduction of a two storey (plus rooms in the roof) new dwelling into an open gap that defines the boundary to the Conservation Area" (Para.5, appeal decision, 28 Nov.2013). Furthermore, the design, scale and layout of the house at plot 1 would have been out of character with and harmful to the character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation area.

A subsequent application for 2 detached two storey dwellings with single garage to rear was refused by the Council on 16th Jan 2014 under ref.13/03677. The reason for refusal was:

The proposed dwellings, by reason of their scale, bulk and prominent positioning in relation to the Sundridge Avenue conservation area, would be harmful to the setting of the adjacent conservation area and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene, contrary to Policies BE1, BE13 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan

Planning permission was also refused on 23rd September 2014 under ref 14/02857/ful for the demolition of existing single storey bungalow and erection of a two storey detached house. It was refused for the following reasons:

The proposed dwelling, by reason of its scale, bulk and positioning in relation to the boundaries, would erode the open character of this corner, harmful to the setting of the Sundridge Avenue Conservation Area and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene, contrary to Policies BE1, BE13, H7 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed development would give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy and amenity to the occupiers of No 40 Orchard Road, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Planning permission was subsequently granted on 15th May 2015 under ref: 15/00862/full for the demolition of the bungalow and the erection for a two storey detached dwellinghouse with associated vehicle parking

Planning permission was refused under ref 16/00895/FUULL1 for Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 8 flats (2x3 bed, 4x2 bed and 2x1 bed) associated parking and landscaping.

- The increase in the number of units will intensify the use of the site and would be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area which comprises predominantly large single family dwelling houses on generous sized plots with no precedent for purpose built flats. This would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the UDP and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan.
- No private amenity space is provided for any of the units which is contrary to Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and the associated Housing SPG 2016
- The size and siting of the proposed development, by reason of their forward building lines would be detrimental to both the street scene and that character and appearance of the adjacent Sundridge Avenue Conservation Area, contrary to Policies BE1, BE11 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan

It was subsequently dismissed on appeal under reference APP/G5180/W/16/3159134 and the context of this appeal decision is discussed below.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties and whether this revised application has overcome the previous dismissed appeal.

Design, Siting and Appearance

Policy BE1 and the Council's Supplementary design guidance seeks to ensure that new development, is of a high quality design that respects the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development. This includes consideration of gaps between dwellings, when they contribute to the character of the area.

There is extensive history on this site as summarised above. The most recent appeal APP/G5180/W/16/3159134 was dismissed on the grounds of the adverse impact in relation to living conditions in respect of outdoor amenity space. In respect of character and appearance, the Inspector in her decision, stated that despite the sensitive location of the appeal site, the proposal would not significantly reduce the existing openness of the plot which allows views into the Conservation Area. In relation to the Council's grounds of refusal relating to the intensification of the use of the site which would be detrimental to the character of the area, the Inspector commented that there would be no doubt that the proposal would result in an increased level of domestic paraphernalia than that of a single family dwelling house. She further accepted that the predominant character of the wider locality is residential with the majority of dwellings being for single family dwellinghouses. However she went on to say that the 'immediate area surrounding the appeal site

consists of a mix of uses, including a school, flats and a number of care/nursing homes. Overall, I consider that the introduction of 8 flats in this location would not generate such a significant increase in activity on the site in comparison to that which already occurs in the immediate area. I therefore do not find that the proposal would represent an over intensification of the site which would undermine the established character of the area.

This current proposal maintains a generous side setback in line with the previously approved application, at approximately 9 and 14m. Further, in terms of the physical building, this proposal is similar in footprint, and bulk to the approved scheme. Whilst the western elevation will be approximately 3m closer to the boundary than the approved scheme, a 5m setback from the boundary will be maintained. The Inspector, on the most recent appeal decision considered the overall bulk and mass to be acceptable and would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Standard of Accommodation

Policy 3.5 of the London Plan states the minimum internal floor space required for residential units on the basis of the level of occupancy that could be reasonably expected within each unit. The minimum standards outlined within Policy 3.5 and the Mayors Housing SPG 2016 have been met. The proposed units would provide a satisfactory level of internal amenity in terms of outlook and sunlight/daylight.

The size of the units remains the same as the previous application which the inspector considered to be acceptable.

Amenity Space

The Mayor of London's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2006 states that private open space is of a high value and should be provided in all new housing developments, Standard 26 of the SPG requires that a minimum of 5 square metres of private outdoor space is provided for 1-2 bedroom units, with a further 1 square metre being provided for each additional occupant and in particular, ground floor flats should preferably have private gardens.

No amenity space was provided on the previous application. In regards to this, the Inspector's decision stated 'I note the suggestion by the appellant that, given the size of the plots that the outdoor space could easily be divided to meet the required standards. However, no proposals have been submitted to show how this could be achieved and therefore an assessment of the potential impact on the character and appearance of the appeal site and wider area is not possible, As such , in the absence of detailed information I am not persuaded that the matter could be dealt with by the imposition of a condition.

Consequently, the proposal would fail to provide a level of outdoor amenity space that could reasonably be expected in the context of such a development. I therefore find that the proposal would cause significant harm to the living conditions of future occupiers contrary to Policy 3.5 of The London Plan and guidance contained within the SPG, which when taken together seek , amongst

other things, to ensure new development provides a good standard of residential amenity for future occupants of buildings'.

In response to this, the application now provides amenity space in the form of balconies on the upper levels, and terraces serving the ground floor units ranging in size from 5sqm to 10sqm terraces areas on the ground floor. Doors rather than windows are now proposed on the ground floor to provide direct access to the terraces. Whilst the level of 'private' open space at ground floor is debatable given the heights of the proposed screening at 1.1m, additional height of the screens would increase the overall bulk and change the character of the building. Therefore on balance, the provision of amenity space is considered to be acceptable.

Impact upon residential amenity.

Two habitable room windows are proposed on the western elevation at first floor level serving a living room and at ground floor serving a bedroom. The first floor level window would be located approximately 12.4m from the boundary and obscure glazing on the lower level is proposed to prevent direct overlooking to the adjacent single storey dwelling 40 Orchard Road. Further, there is adequate separation to the boundary and the proposal is not considered to have any adverse impact upon the amenities of No.40 Orchard Road.

To the south, there would remain a substantial separation between the proposed houses and 19 Sundridge Avenue, which is a nursing home and as such the impact on the amenities of residents at the home is considered acceptable.

The balconies serving Units 7 and 8 in the roofspace will be located in the north and south elevation, to prevent direct overlooking to the neighbouring properties. The two balconies on the western elevation at first floor level serving Units 5 and 6 would look towards the flank wall of the neighbouring property No. 40 Orchard Road.

The Inspector on the previous application did not consider that there would be any adverse impact upon neighbouring amenity and the proposed amenity space is not considered to cause significant overlooking to warrant refusal.

Highways and Traffic Issues

The site is located in an area with low PTAL rate of 1b (on a scale of 1 - 6, where 6 is the most accessible). It is therefore likely that future residents will own cars.

Car Parking and traffic impact

The development is situated on the corner of Orchard Road and Sundridge Avenue, which is accessed via both Orchard Road to the north and Sundridge Avenue to the east. Orchard Road forms a priority controlled junction with Sundridge Avenue at the north east corner of the site. Immediately opposite the site is Beaside Preparatory School; also there are school keep clear road markings in the vicinity of the school entrance on the north side of Orchard Road and a pelican crossing approximately 10 metres to the west of the site access. There are

double yellow lines at the junction with Sundridge Avenue prohibiting parking at all times.

The maximum residential parking standards require up to 1.5 parking spaces for 3 bed properties and less than 1 parking space per unit for 1-2 bed properties . Eleven car parking spaces are indicated on the submitted plans accessed utilising the existing access arrangements. This is acceptable and complies with the maximum standards as set out in the UDP. Three additional spaces have therefore been provided.

The peak hour for residential development would be in the morning peak between 8:00 to 9:00am 0.408 vehicles per dwelling will depart i.e. $9 \times 0.408 = 4$ vehicles and 1 will arrive in the morning peak. Similarly in the afternoon peak between 17:00 and 18:00 0.361 will arrive $9 \times 0.361 = 3$ to 4 car will arrive. As it can be seen from these figures the impact on the network is minimal and the afternoon peak does not coincide with the school departure.

The previous inspector considered the provision of parking space and traffic impact and raised no objection.

Cycle storage

A covered and secure cycle storage facility is provided for the flats to encourage cycling as a sustainable transport alternative cycle parking will be needed at 1 space per 1 bed unit and 2 spaces for all other dwellings and this could be dealt with by condition.

Trees

The application site is largely free of mature trees and is currently landscaped with a large area of lawn and a number of flower beds, planted with occasional low level shrubs. The application site appears to be large enough to accommodate the proposed development, whilst retaining aspects of the current design/layout. As details of landscaping have not been submitted with the application, a condition could be required requesting further details

Having had regard to the above and taking into consideration the inspector decision, member may consider that the provision of amenity space is now acceptable.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file 17/01241 and planning history set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 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.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development

- 3 Details of a scheme of landscaping, which shall include the materials of paved areas and other hard surfaces, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The approved scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following the first occupation of the buildings or the substantial completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the substantial completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally planted.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development.

- 4 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied boundary enclosures of a height and type to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be erected in such positions along the boundaries of the site(s) as shall be approved and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of visual amenity and the amenities of adjacent properties.

- 5 Details of a surface water drainage system (including storage facilities where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved system shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

6 No development shall take place until details of drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of any dwelling. Prior to the submission of those details, an assessment shall be carried out into the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage systems set out in Annex F of PPS25, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage system scheme (SuDS) is to be implemented, the submitted details shall:

i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and / or surface waters;

ii) specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SuDS scheme, together with a timetable for that implementation; and

iii) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The scheme shall be implemented, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details

Reason: To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage and to accord with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

7 Before commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted parking spaces and/or garages and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

- 8** Before commencement of the development hereby permitted details of (a) turning area(s) within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The turning area(s) shall be provided before any part of the development is first occupied and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policies T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and to enable vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward direction, in the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

- 9** While the development hereby permitted is being carried out a suitable hardstanding shall be provided with wash-down facilities for cleaning the wheels of vehicles and any accidental accumulation of mud of the highway caused by such vehicles shall be removed without delay and in no circumstances be left behind at the end of the working day.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety and in order to comply with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 10** Details of arrangements for storage of refuse and recyclable materials (including means of enclosure for the area concerned where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved arrangements shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate refuse storage facilities in a location which is acceptable from the residential and visual amenity aspects.

- 11** Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided at the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 6.9 of the London Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

- 12** Details of a scheme to light the access drive and car parking areas hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby

permitted is commenced. The approved scheme shall be self-certified to accord with BS 5489 - 1:2003 and be implemented before the development is first occupied and the lighting shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 and Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan in the interest of visual amenity and the safety of occupiers of and visitors to the development.

- 13** Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include measures of how construction traffic can access the site safely and how potential traffic conflicts can be minimised; the route construction traffic shall follow for arriving at and leaving the site and the hours of operation, but shall not be limited to these. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T5, T6, T7, T15, T16 & T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 14** Surface water from private land shall not discharge on to the highway. Details of the drainage system for surface water drainage to prevent the discharge of surface water from private land on to the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the drainage system shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained permanently thereafter.

- 15** No loose materials shall be used for surfacing of the parking and turning area hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety and in order to comply with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan

- 16** Details of the proposed slab levels of the building(s) and the existing site levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before work commences and the development shall be completed strictly in accordance with the approved levels.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

17 The existing buildings on the site shall be demolished and the site cleared prior to the commencement of the development for the new dwelling hereby permitted.

Reason: In order to comply with Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/01955/FULL1

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : 61 The Avenue Beckenham BR3 5EE

OS Grid Ref: E: 538603 N: 169870

Applicant : Mr Ron Terry

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 two storey buildings with basements and accommodation in roof space, each comprising 3 no. two bedroom flats (6 flats in total) including formation of lightwells, associated landscaping, cycle and car parking and formation of vehicular access.

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Downs Hill
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

It is proposed to demolish the existing detached dwelling and to erect two detached buildings with accommodation in the roof space and at basement level (with lightwells) along with the formation of a vehicular access.

The buildings would be sited with their front elevations at a right angle to each other, with Block A sited adjacent to the western boundary of the site, broadly aligning with No. 59a. Block B would be sited adjacent to the northern boundary of the site, adjacent to No. 67 The Avenue.

A separation of approx. 3.3m is shown to be provided between the flank elevation of building A and the western boundary and approx. 2.8m side space would be provided between the northern flank elevation of Block B and the boundary. The buildings would be sited with a separation between them of approx. 5m.

The proposed buildings would each provide 3 two bedroom split level flats. The internal layout of each block is replicated, with a basement/ground floor flat, a ground floor/first floor flat and a first floor/attic flat. Block A comprises Flats 1, 2 and 3. Flat 1 is arranged over the ground and first floors, Flat 2 over the ground and basement floors and Flat 3 over the first floor and attic/roof accommodation. Similarly, Flats 4, 5 and 6 in Block B would provide a similar configuration/internal layout.

In the case of each block, the proportions, external appearance and siting of the buildings broadly replicates that of the previously permitted scheme for the

provision of 2 five bedroom dwellings with the exception of the formation of lightwells, the excavation of a basement storey associated with one of the flats in each block and the addition of balconies over the previously pitched roof bays to provide amenity space for the upper level flats in each building. As previously (ref. 16/05164), the proposed buildings would incorporate a deeply pitched roof sloping down from the ridge to end above the top of the ground floor front facing window, with a modest front facing dormer set within this roof slope. Gabled front projections are also proposed to each building, to the western side of Block A and the northern side of Block B. The decorative gable of Block A would be tile hung while that of Block B would be incorporate decorative brick set within a mock-tudor timber/render detailing.

To the front of the proposed buildings a hardstanding would provide off-street parking at a level of 3 spaces per block (i.e. 1 space per two bedroom flat). Bicycle storage would be provided in structures sited between and forward of the proposed blocks. Refuse stores would be provided within each proposed curtilage towards the front of the site, adjacent to the vehicular accessway. The parking spaces would be accessed via crossovers towards the western and northern boundaries on either side of the site. The application redline site incorporates the verge area to the front of the site. The agent has confirmed under the previous application that a licence has been obtained from the landowner (Cator Estates) to carry out the crossover works and other landscaping works in front of the boundary.

In terms of amenity space, private amenity space would be provided to each flat, with those covering the basement and ground floors benefitting from ground level terraces/the space provided by the excavated lightwells. The flats which are located at first/second floor level have private balconies which would face towards the site frontage/across the front of the site and which would measure 6.15m². In addition to these balconies, first floor rear balconies would be provided above the ground floor bay projection of each block in a position identical to those considered under reference 16/05164. The balconies would each have a full height brick screen wall elongating the first floor western and northern flank elevations of Block A and Block B respectively. The blocks would be sited within landscaped grounds and the fence which formerly separated house A from House B under the permission 16/05164 is shown to be removed in the current scheme so the blocks would occupy one large site rather than forming 2 separate residential curtilages.

Location

The application site is located to the northern edge of The Avenue at its eastern end, towards the junction with Downs Hill. It forms the southern boundary of the Downs Hill Conservation Area. The Avenue is an unmade and unadopted highway.

The application site is occupied by a detached two storey dwelling close to the northern boundary of the site. The site is a prominent, large corner site, elevated above the road junction. The host dwelling is not considered to be of any particular architectural merit.

Other properties in the locality are of commensurate size and scale to the existing dwelling, although the nearest dwellings in The Avenue are generally set more

modest plots than is characteristic to the north, west and east of the site, incorporating that part of Downs Hill that lies within the Conservation Area. The siting of the existing dwelling towards the northern boundary of the site leaves a generous area of garden land between the host property and the southern and eastern boundaries, and this retained space between built development makes a positive contribution to the Downs Hill Conservation Area since it can be seen from within Downs Hill. The site is densely treed and the mature trees, landscaping and spaciousness of the site contribute to a semi-rural quality to the area.

To the south of the site and on the opposite side of The Avenue is a flatted development known as West Oak, which falls outside of the Conservation Area. The four properties within the conservation area to the west are detached two storey dwellings. Beyond this to the west at both northern and southern edges of The Avenue the development comprises predominantly blocks of flats ranging in size and design.

The Downs Hill Conservation Area was designated in 1989 and the Council adopted a Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) document for the Downs Hill Conservation Area which was the subject of public consultation.

The Conservation Area is broadly characterised by detached dwellings, unified by their age and their incorporation of neo-Tudor and neo-vernacular elements, including timber beams and cottage effect modest dormer windows.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and a number of representations were received, which can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal would result in a high density of development compared with the average density in the conservation area of 3 persons per household
- The land use of the property should not be changed from its current use
- Proposal would lead to overlooking of previously private areas
- Loss of views from neighbouring properties
- Unreasonable overshadowing
- Increased noise nuisance, general disturbance, odour, car movement and car parking would be unacceptably intrusive
- Proposal would constitute garden grabbing
- Proposal would appear over-bearing, out of scale and out of character compared with existing properties in the conservation area
- Adverse impact on highway safety and convenience of other road users
- The character of the area comprises single family dwellings
- Living accommodation in the basement could lead to subsidence and would be out of character with the area
- The balconies would result in a loss of privacy
- Lack of parking will result in overspill on Downs Hill
- Would set a precedent for other flatted development
- Reference to the Party Wall Act relating to the basements and the Human Rights Act with reference to the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions

- The Council has only permitted single family dwellings on the site with previous applications for flats having been refused
- The Avenue is unadopted and in poor condition which means that the visibility splays will not be adequate.

The Copers Cope Residents Association have raised objections stating that there is potential for up to 24 adults to live at the development and there is therefore inadequate parking. The entrance to one of the blocks is situated on a tight bend in the road. The basement accommodation would suggest that it is an overdevelopment of the site and the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

A letter of support has been received which states that the proposal would lead to more affordable housing in the area and the buildings are designed so that they would appear as houses rather than flats.

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas (APCA) raise no objections to the proposal.

Technical comments

No objections are raised, subject to conditions, from a drainage perspective.

From a technical highways perspective it is noted that if the cycle storage was closer to the entrance of the building it would encourage greater cycle use by residents, maximising security and convenience. The site is located in an area with a PTAL rate of 2 on a scale of 1 - 6 and it would be ideal if there were 2 car parking spaces for visitors i.e. 4 parking spaces for each block. A number of conditions are suggested should planning permission be granted.

Planning Considerations

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
 T18 Road Safety

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 & 2.

Supplementary Planning Guidance: Downs Hill Conservation Area.

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. A period of consultation on the proposed draft Local Plan (under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England)

Regulations 2012 as amended) ran from November 2016 and closed on December 31st 2016. It is anticipated that the draft Local Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State in 2017.

Draft Policy 1	Housing Supply
Draft Policy 64	Housing Design
Draft Policy 30	Parking
Draft Policy 37	General Design of Development
Draft Policy 8	Side Space
Draft Policy 11	Conservation Areas
Draft Policy 73	Development and Trees

The application falls to be considered in accordance with the following policies of the London Plan:

- 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
- 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
- 3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments
- 3.8 Housing Choice
- 3.9 Mixed and Balanced Communities
- 5.12 Flood Risk Management
- 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.1 Building London's Neighbourhoods and Communities
- 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
- 7.3 Designing Out Crime
- 7.4 Local Character
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
- 7.21 Trees and Woodland
- 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Mayor's Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance.

The National Planning Policy Framework, with which the above policies are considered to be consistent.

Planning History

81/01123 Permission refused for two detached houses

82/01136 Permission refused for four terraced dwellings

Both these applications relate to the erection of No. 59 and No. 59a on land that was formerly part of No. 61. The refusal of two dwellings under ref. 81/01123 was subsequently allowed at appeal.

15/02906

Under reference 15/02906 planning permission was refused for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of 2 part two/three storey flatted blocks. Permission was refused on the ground:

"The proposals, by reason of the size, height, bulk and massing of the buildings, would result in an overdevelopment of the site and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Downs Hill Conservation Area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1, BE11 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan."

A subsequent appeal against the refusal of planning permission was dismissed.

The Inspector identified "unifying factors" within the Conservation Area, including the widespread use of bay windows, applied timber framing and white rendering, with a cottage effect in some dwellings achieved through the provision of small dormers set into the roof.

The Inspector considered that the substantial footprint and volume of the buildings would have meant that the proposal would have appeared cramped and out of keeping with the surrounding area. In particular, she referred to the small gap provided between the buildings and the consequent relationship between the buildings being very close when compared to most other buildings in the conservation area. The Inspector further referred to the bulkiness of the roof forms of the proposed buildings, incorporating a central flat roofed element which would have appeared much bulkier when compared with other more traditional roof forms in the area, while noting that the overall roof heights would have been broadly consistent with 59A and the general increase in ridge heights along Downs Hill.

In conclusion, it was found that the proposed development would have failed to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, with particular concern expressed as summarised above, regarding the cramped nature of the development, lack of space between the buildings and the bulkiness of the roof forms.

14/03502

Under reference 14/03502 planning permission was refused for the demolition of the existing detached dwelling and the erection of two storey buildings with accommodation within the roofspace to provide eight two bedroom flats. The previously refused proposal incorporated 12 car parking spaces accessed via a total of 3 vehicular access points (2 new vehicular accesses and the retention of the existing access). Planning permission was refused on the following grounds:

"1. The proposals, by reason of the size, height, bulk and massing of the buildings, would result in an overdevelopment of the site, which would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Downs Hill Conservation Area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1, BE11 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and London Plan Policy 3.9.*

2. The proposed rear balconies would result in overlooking of neighbouring properties which would be detrimental to residential amenity and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan."

*The appeal Inspector acknowledged at the subsequent appeal that this was a typographical error and that rather than Policy 3.9, Policy 3.5 of the London Plan was relevant.

A subsequent appeal against the Council's refusal of planning permission was dismissed under reference APP/G5180/W/14/3001656. The Inspector considered that the main issues for consideration were the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the impact of the proposals on residential amenity.

With regards to the impact of the proposal on residential amenity, referred to in reason 2 of the Council's decision notice, the Inspector found that the screening and distance between the existing and proposed development would mitigate the level of overlooking to an acceptable extent. He also considered that although the scheme may have resulted in some additional overshadowing of neighbouring properties, that impact was not significant and that there would not be a conflict with Policy BE1 in respect of the impact of the proposals on residential amenity.

With regards to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, however, the Inspector found that the scheme would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The Inspector reasoned that the appeal site is prominently located and elevated above the road junction. The depth of two storey development was considered to be greater than both neighbouring properties, and the height and depth of development, including a deep roof accommodating a second floor, would "give each block a substantial bulk and scale."

He considered that "The mass of development so close to neighbouring buildings would cause the scheme to have a cramped and dominant appearance, which would contrast unfavourably with the more spacious characteristics of the CA."

The two new driveways would to an extent offset the retention of trees along the site's frontage and the additional proposed landscaping, opening up some views into the site from the highway. At paragraph 14 of the decision notice the Inspector stated: "The 3 driveways together with hardstanding areas for 12 cars to the front and side of the buildings, and residents' bin enclosures, would result in a more intensely used and urban character, which would contrast markedly with the CA's established character of single detached dwellings, and its semi-rural appearance."

In conclusion, the Inspector found:

"It is each block's substantial massing so close to neighbouring development, together with the introduction of large areas of parking, driveways and other facilities towards the front of this prominent plot that would harm the streetscene, and make the proposal significantly at odds with other development in the CA."

16/05164

Planning permission was granted for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of 2 large detached dwellings.

Conclusions

The main issues in the determination of this application are considered to be the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area in general and the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Downs Hill Conservation Area in particular. In addition, the impact of the proposals on residential amenity falls to be considered, as does the highways impact and the extent to which the proposal would provide adequate parking to serve the needs of the development.

Principle of development

It is noted that in the case of each of the previously refused schemes the Council did not raise an in principle objection to the flatted developments within the grounds for refusal, which related instead to the scale, massing, bulk and height of the development and the consequent overdevelopment of the site.

In dismissing the appeals against the Council's refusal of planning permission, the appeal Inspectors similarly did not express concerns over the principle of flatted blocks, but instead focussed on the scale and bulk of the buildings, the side space and spaciousness of the development and the height and depth of the block/s.

It is acknowledged in the appeal relating to 14/03502 (8 flats, 12 car parking spaces) it was noted that the scale and bulk (necessitated by the number of flats proposed) of the development and the 3 driveways, large hardstanding areas and bin enclosures would have resulted in a more intensely used and urban character "which would contrast markedly with the CA's established character of single detached dwellings, and its semi-rural appearance." However the appeal was not dismissed on the basis that flats were proposed, but on the basis that the buildings within which the flats would be provided and the associated hardstandings/paraphernalia associated with the number of units would have failed to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

In the appeal under ref. 15/02906 (8 flats/8 car parking spaces) the unifying factors identified within the Conservation Area by the Inspector related principally to the appearance of the buildings and the design details. The volume and footprint of the buildings resulted in a cramped appearance out of keeping with the area and the bulkiness of the roof was considered unacceptable.

A number of the objections raised by local residents and the CCRA regarding the proposals relate to the fact that the scheme would provide flatted residential units rather than the single family dwellings previously granted planning permission under reference 16/05164. While these concerns are acknowledged, it is not considered that the refusal of planning permission on the basis that the

development would provide flats would be sustainable on appeal in view of the planning history of the site, although the visual and residential impact of the development and the intensity of the use of the site is discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections.

Impact of the proposal on residential amenity

The main differences between the current proposal and that granted planning permission under reference 16/05164 in respect of the impact of the proposal on residential amenity relate to the provision of an additional balcony to each block and the increased intensity of the residential use of the site and the extent to which this might result in increased noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents.

The previously refused planning applications and subsequent appeal decisions found that the impact of those schemes on residential amenity would have been acceptable. With regards to the appeal under reference 14/03502 which proposed 8 flats in total, the Inspector stated that he was satisfied that the reasonable use of the flats and vehicular movements associated with them would not cause significant noise and other disturbance to the local residents. This conclusion was shared in the appeal under reference 15/02906 which also proposed 8 flats, where the current scheme relates to 6 flats in total.

With regards to the impact by way of overshadowing and loss of privacy, the Council's reasons for refusal in the previous schemes did not relate to the residential impact of the proposals and the subsequent appeal decisions took into account the separation between the developments previously proposed and the opposing garden boundaries and the screening afforded by the retained and proposed trees and landscaping, concluding that there was no substantive evidence that the development would result in loss of privacy or overshadowing in those more bulky schemes.

Planning permission was granted under reference 16/05164 for development of a height, depth and bulk relative to ground level identical to the current proposal. It was not considered in the assessment of that proposal that the proposal would harm the residential amenities of neighbouring residents. It is noted that the buildings in this application would each include an additional balcony but these balconies are positioned to face towards the front with views from the side towards the boundaries with No. 67 to the north and No. 59a to the west obscured in the case of Block A towards No. 67 by the building of Block B and a separation of approx. 21m to the western boundary from the balcony at Block B. As such it is not considered that these balconies would result in unacceptable loss of privacy or overlooking.

The lightwells proposed to be provided would be sited broadly between the two blocks. As such and as a consequence of the orientation and siting of the buildings within the site it is not considered that the three storey height of the buildings where the basements would be lit by the lightwells would result in a significant visual impact from adjoining residential dwellings. The height of the building at these points would be largely obscured by the ground level adjacent to the lightwells and the perspective view from neighbouring properties would also be

screened by boundary fencing and trees/landscaping to the extent that the amendments to the elevations of the buildings in comparison with the approved scheme would not be readily appreciable.

Impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

It has been acknowledged at appeal that the Council has no objection in principle to the loss of the existing building as the house itself is not considered to be of any particular architectural merit. The Inspector in each case has not disagreed with this view.

Under reference 16/05164 planning permission was granted for buildings that in terms of their height, siting and external appearance replicated the current scheme other than in the provision of the front balconies referred to above and the provision of the large rear/side lightwells which relate to a split level flat within each block. The differences in terms of the development on the site under 16/05164 and the current proposal can be summarised:

- Formation of lightwells to provide basement accommodation for a split level flat
- Additional balcony to front/side at first floor level
- Provision of enlarged cycle storage
- Refuse storage to be sited adjacent to the driveways within 1.2m high close boarded bin enclosures
- Deletion of proposed fencing between the buildings

It falls to be considered whether the amendments in terms of the appearance of the buildings would be so significant as to render the application unacceptable in terms of the impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of the conservation area. In reaching a conclusion on this aspect it is appropriate to take into account the reasoning of the appeal Inspectors in the previously refused and dismissed schemes where the physical proportions, bulk, siting and external appearance of those blocks were considered to fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, alongside the granting of planning permission under reference 16/05164 for development of substantially similar proportions and external appearance to that currently proposed, albeit for dwellings rather than a flatted development.

As such, it is not considered that the proposal would have a materially greater impact on the visual amenity of the area nor upon the character and appearance of the conservation area than the approved proposals. While previous schemes for flatted development were dismissed, these decisions did not relate to the fact that the proposals would have provided flats, but rather to the undesirable visual impact associated with the number of units and the scale of the built development including extent of hardstanding on the site. The extent of the currently proposed development on the site, its height, external appearance and the amount of hardstanding appreciable from outside the site is not substantially different to that granted planning permission under reference 16/05164.

The rear lightwells in elevation form result in development on the inside corner of each building that would appear recognisably three storey from a vantage point within the application site, from the grounds at the rear of the buildings and the amenity terraces. However, in terms of the extent to which the part of the building elevations relating to the excavated lightwells would be readily appreciable from outside of the site, in view of the separation of at least 18m to the front of the site and taking into account the slightly lower perspective view afforded from the street scene, it is not on balance considered that the enlargement of the structures to include basement accommodation would have a significantly greater impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area than the previously permitted scheme. While basement accommodation is not a common characteristic of the locality, it is noted that planning permission was granted under reference 14/03219 for the redevelopment of the site at 28 Downs Hill for a single dwelling incorporating a large basement area. In view of the discreet siting of the lightwells associated with the basement accommodation it is considered that this aspect of the proposal that differs with that granted planning permission under reference 16/05164 would not have a significant impact on the visual amenities and character of the area.

While the cycle stores proposed to be provided would be larger than those granted planning permission under reference 16/05164 and the proposal includes also terraces to the rear of the buildings that would serve as private amenity space, these aspects would not be considered out of character within the curtilage of a single dwellinghouse and in terms of the overall proportion of the site given over to buildings and hard surfaces it is not considered that the proposal would appear out of character with or detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is acknowledged that the proposal would result in a larger proportion of the site being developed than is currently the case but taking into account the grant of planning permission under reference 16/05164 it is considered that the development would retain a level of spaciousness and separation between dwellings appropriate to the conservation area setting.

Living conditions

Each two bedroom unit would have access to private amenity space although in the case of Flats 3 and 6, this would be in the form of an elevated private balcony of 6.15m² which is less generous than the other flats within the blocks but which would meet the minimum area provided within the Mayor's Housing SPG. The internal dimensions of the flats would exceed the "technical housing standards - national described space standard" requirements for two bedroom split level flats.

The ground floor/basement split level flats (flats 2 and 4) would incorporate a large area of basement accommodation and bedroom 1 of each flat would have a floor to ceiling window looking onto the lightwell, with bedroom 2 incorporating larger patio doors. The area of the terrace formed by the lightwells, which would serve each part basement flat, would be approx. 18m². The lightwells would be approx. 2.5m deep. Each bedroom within the part basement flats has a limited outlook but in view of the width/length of the lightwell and the fact that each flat would also include dual aspect ground floor accommodation it is considered on balance that

the standard of accommodation for these particular flats would not be unacceptable.

Highways and parking issues

The proposal would provide 1 space per two bed flat. In view of the public transport accessibility of the site (PTAL 2) it has been recommended that ideally the proposal would include the provision of an additional visitors parking bay per block, which would result in 4 spaces per block and 8 spaces overall. It is necessary to carefully consider whether in terms of the merits of the application proposal overall, the lack of a separate visitors parking space for each block would represent strong grounds for the refusal of planning permission, taking into account also the desire to limit the extent of hardstanding to the front of the building so as to reduce the visual impact of the development when viewed from public areas within the conservation area.

The provision of 1 space per two bedroom flat would comply with the maximum parking standards of the London Plan and also with the minimum provisions of Draft Policy 30 of the emerging local plan. On balance, while it would be preferable from a highways perspective to provide a parking space for visitors to each block, it is desirable also to ensure that as much of the site is free from development as possible in order to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and the proposals would also comply with the standards of the London Plan and the emerging Local Plan policy in respect of parking provision. Cycle parking would be provided at a level of 12 spaces for the 6 units proposed and while technical comments have stated that the siting of the storage units would be of optimal convenience and security if they were positioned closer to the front entrances of the blocks, this is not considered in itself to warrant the refusal of planning permission and a condition imposed if permission is granted could see this issue being addressed where appropriate.

While local concern has been expressed regarding the impact of the proposal on highway safety, no such technical concerns have been expressed subject to the use of conditions to secure satisfactory visibility splays along with other highways conditions.

Other matters

Concerns have been raised regarding the basement excavation and the impact that this could have on subsidence. This is not a planning matter and would be dealt with by separate legislation and under the Building Regulations.

Taking into account the appraisal of the previously dismissed schemes and that granted planning permission under reference 16/05164 it is not considered that the proposal would contravene the provisions of the Human Rights Act.

The applicant provided under the previous application confirmation that the redline site incorporated the verge area to the front of the site and that a license had been obtained from the landowner (Cator Estates) to carry out the crossover works and

other landscaping works in front of the boundary. This licensing requirement is a private legal matter.

Conclusions

With regards to the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of neighbouring residents, the proposed buildings would not project significantly to the front and rear of neighbouring dwellings and adequate side space is retained to the boundaries so as to limit the impact of the proposal on the amenities of established adjacent dwellings. Where some concern was expressed in the consideration of the previous application regarding the potential for mutual overlooking from balconies to the gardens associated with the then proposed dwellings, the current scheme proposes flats with a mix of private amenity space and communal grounds and this potential overlooking is not therefore considered unsatisfactory. The balconies which formed part of the previous scheme continue to incorporate brick screening which effectively restricts potential views from the balconies to established neighbouring residential sites. The additional balconies proposed would be sited sufficiently separate from neighbouring gardens and dwellings to limit impact associated with loss of privacy, taking into account their position within the site and the retained/proposed landscaping.

The separation between the buildings and their design and siting in relation to the size and position of the plot would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and would result in development of a built form, scale and design commensurate with other dwellings in the immediate locality when viewed from public vantage points. While the current proposal incorporates the excavation of lightwells and the erection of effectively three storeys of vertical building in association with these lightwells, the extent to which this part of the development would be visible from outside of the site would be limited and as such the impact of this aspect on the character and appearance of the conservation area would be acceptable on balance.

It is noted that local concerns have been raised regarding the principle of flatted development in this part of the conservation area. It is acknowledged that immediately neighbouring properties comprise single dwellinghouses and that the conservation area is broadly characterised by detached dwellings rather than flatted blocks. However it is also noted that outside of the conservation area within The Avenue the street is more mixed in character including blocks of flats including those opposite the site at West Oak. In terms of the built form of the development as viewed from the public realm and from outside of the site, along with the extent of the driveway and parking areas, the development would have the appearance of separate dwellinghouses, with the flatted nature of the scheme not being widely appreciable from outside the site. Taking this into account along with the previous appeal determinations and refusal grounds which did not raise specific concerns regarding the type of residential development proposed as opposed to the appearance, bulk, scale and extent of development within the site, it is not considered that the refusal of planning permission on the basis of the provision of flats would constitute strong grounds for the refusal of planning permission.

On balance it is recommended that planning permission be granted for the proposals.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs: 17/01955, 16/05164, 15/02906 and 14/03502 excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Details of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: 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

- 3 Details of the windows (including rooflights and dormers where appropriate) including their materials, method of opening and drawings showing sections through mullions, transoms and glazing bars and sills, arches, lintels and reveals (including dimension of any recess) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The windows shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: 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.

- 4 Before commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted parking spaces and/or garages and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (England) 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

- 5 The arrangements for storage of refuse (which shall include provision for the storage and collection of recyclable materials) and the means of enclosure shown on the approved drawings shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate refuse storage facilities in a location which is acceptable from the residential and visual amenity aspects.

- 6 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided at the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 6.9 of the London Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

- 7 Details of a scheme to light the access drive and car parking areas hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby permitted is commenced. The approved scheme shall be self-certified to accord with BS 5489 - 1:2003 and be implemented before the development is first occupied and the lighting shall be permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 and Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan in the interest of visual amenity and the safety of occupiers of and visitors to the development.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a survey of the condition of the road shall be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority and any damage caused to the surface of the road during the construction phase of the development will be reinstated to a standard at least commensurate with its condition prior to the commencement of the development.**

Reason: In the interests of pedestrian and vehicular safety and the amenities of the area and to accord with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 9** The application site is located within an Air Quality Management Area declared for NOx. In order to minimise the impact of the development on local air quality any gas boilers must meet a dry NOx demission rate of <40mg/kWh.

Reason: To minimise the effect of the development on local air quality within an Air Quality Management Area, to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 7.14 of the London Plan.

- 10** Details of a surface water drainage system (including storage facilities where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved system shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: To secure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage.

- 11** No development shall take place until details of drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of any dwelling. Prior to the submission of those details, an assessment shall be carried out into the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage systems set out in Annex F of PPS25, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage system scheme (SuDS) is to be implemented, the submitted details shall:

i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and / or surface waters;

ii) specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SuDS scheme, together with a timetable for that implementation; and

iii) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The scheme shall be implemented, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details

Reason: In order to provide a sustainable drainage system to serve the proposed development.

- 12 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted details of the appearance of the front boundary railings and gates (where appropriate) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The gates/railings shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.**

Reason: In the interest of the appearance of the site, the visual amenities of the street scene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, to accord with Policies BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 13 Details of a scheme of landscaping, which shall include the materials of paved areas and other hard surfaces, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The approved scheme shall be implemented in the first planting season following the first occupation of the buildings or the substantial completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the substantial completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally planted.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development.

- 14 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.**

Reason: In the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area and the character and appearance of the conservation area, in order to comply with Policies H7, BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan.

You are further informed that :

- 1** You are advised that this application may be liable for the payment of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the Planning Act 2008. The London Borough of Bromley is the Collecting Authority for the Mayor and this Levy is payable on the commencement of development (defined in Part 2, para 7 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). It is the responsibility of the owner and /or person(s) who have a material interest in the relevant land to pay the Levy (defined under Part 2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). If you fail to follow the payment procedure, the collecting authority may impose surcharges on this liability, take enforcement action, serve a stop notice to prohibit further development on the site and/or take action to recover the debt. Further information about Community Infrastructure Levy can be found on attached information note and the Bromley website www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL

- 2** You should consult the Land Charges and Street Naming/Numbering Section at the Civic Centre on 020 8313 4742 or e-mail: address.management@bromley.gov.uk regarding Street Naming and Numbering. Fees and application forms are available on the Council's website at www.bromley.gov.uk

- 3** Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx. 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Water pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/01968/FULL6

Ward:
Chislehurst

Address : 11 Gravelwood Close Chislehurst BR7
6JT

OS Grid Ref: E: 544215 N: 172152

Applicant : Ms Melinda Huynh

Objections : No

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey rear and single storey front extensions

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 16

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part one/two storey side & rear extensions with single storey front extension.

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property located on the southern side of Gravelwood Close, Chislehurst. The surrounding area is characterised by residential properties comprising semi-detached and terrace building types.

The ground floor element has a depth of 4m with the first floor having the same depth, whilst set off from the boundary with No.9 by 3.5m.

The extensions are shown to be built from colour facing brick, matching roof tiles and finished with white render.

Amended plans were received on 8th June 2017, showing several obscure glazed windows to be inserted into the flank elevation.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

Comments from Consultees

Highways - the proposal may lead to the loss of one car parking space, two should be provided.

Planning Considerations

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space
T3 Parking
T18 Road Safety

The above policies are considered to be consistent with the principles and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which is a key consideration in the determination of this application.

The Councils adopted SPG guidance is also a consideration.

There is no planning history associated with the site.

Draft Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the draft Local Plan will be to the Secretary of State in mid 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development
Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

Policies H8, BE1 and the Council's Supplementary design guidance seek to ensure that new development, including residential extensions are of a high quality design that respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development.

Policy 7.4 of the London Plan seeks that buildings should provide a high quality design that has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass and contributes positively to the character of the area. Consistent with this the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that new development should reflect the identity of local surroundings and add to the overall quality of the area.

Policy BE1 also seeks to ensure that new development proposals, including residential extensions respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings

and that their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by loss of outlook or overshadowing.

Policy H9 of the UDP relates specifically to side space and normally seeks a minimum of 1m side space for development, including residential extensions, of two storeys or more, to prevent a cramped appearance within the streetscene and to safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

Design

The bulk to the proposed development is to the right hand side of the property with the garage converted to a storage area, utility room and enlarged kitchen on the ground floor. The existing footprint of the house is shown to be reconfigured. At first floor level the existing bedrooms are shown to be reconfigured and an additional bedroom added together with an ensuite. An enlarged porch area is also proposed to the front of the property which is shown to be flush with the new side extension.

The application property forms one half of a semi-detached pair, both of which benefit from the original roof design which includes a hipped roof arrangement. The proposed side extension would form a continuation of the existing ridge line and would sit flush with the existing front building line. Supplementary Planning Guidance indicates the importance of retaining the architectural integrity of the host dwelling, with extensions being required to respect the buildings composition, especially the roof and rhythm of form, the hipped style roof arrangement would be maintained and the limited width (2.5m) of the extension would not imbalance the relationship between the host dwelling and that of the neighbour at No. 9.

The proposed two storey side extension would be built up to the side boundary adjoining the alleyway to the western boundary. Whilst the proposal will be built to the boundary, any impact is significantly mitigated by the 2.5-3m alleyway that adjoins the site. The existence of this permanent separation is such that the proposal will not result in any unrelated terracing or have any detrimental impact on the spatial standard evident in the area.

Given these mitigating set of circumstances, the proposal is not considered to result in a detrimental impact on the streetscene or in a cramped appearance, nor result in any loss of visual amenity in line with the guidance set out in Policy H9.

The two rear extension would add bulk and mass to the side and rear of the property on the eastern elevation. Amended plans received on the 8th June show that several high level windows, to be obscure glazed, are to be added to the flank elevation. Given that all the windows are to be obscure glazed and will be secondary windows no objection is raised to this amendment to the plans. The rear element of the extension is shown to be part two storey/part single storey. The two storey element would be set down from the main ridge line and would be off-set from the neighbour at No.9 by 3.5m. The two storey rear element is considered acceptable on the basis that it would have adequate separation from the boundary with No.9 by not causing a significant loss of light or outlook. The single storey part of the extension measures 4m in depth x 3.3m in width x 2.8m in height with a flat

roof. The single storey part of the extension would just be visible above the line of existing boundary fence.

The conversion of the existing garage to storage is considered acceptable. The submitted drawings show that the garage door would remain but the front extension will be built 1.5m further forward than the existing building line. The property benefits from an existing driveway which can accommodate one car comfortably, two at a push. The Highways officer has suggested that the applicant should show how two cars could be accommodated in the front garden. Further to a site visit it was clear to see that off street parking is available in Gravelwood Close and the property can still accommodate one off-street car parking space which is sufficient without causing any on-street traffic problems.

In terms of proposed materials, the submitted drawings show the outside of the house will be painted with white render and facing brickwork. Whilst white render is not typical of the surrounding streetscene on balance this is considered acceptable. No.9 is currently finished with brickwork whilst No.11 is finished with pebble dashing. The intended render finish is consistent with the prevailing nature of development in the wider area, and would be finished to a satisfactory degree.

Neighbouring amenity

Policy BE1 seeks to ensure that new development proposals, including residential extensions respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and that their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing.

The main impact of the proposal would be on No. 9 and No.13 & 15 Gravelwood Close.

The proposed extension would abut the rear boundary with No.9 with a part single storey/part two storey extension. The depth and height of the single storey extension is considered to be acceptable and the two storey element is considered to be located far enough away to not cause a significant detriment to warrant refusal of the application.

The side extension will abut the boundary to the front elevation with the alleyway that separates the host property with No. 13 & 15 Gravelwood Close. No.13 &15 are set further back from the roadside than No.11 to not be significantly affected by the development.

On balance Members may consider that the side extension is only 2.5m wide and not overly bulky to detract from either the host dwelling or the wider character and appearance of the area. The two storey rear element abuts the boundary with the alleyway where a 2.5-3m gap exists to the neighbours on the other side, whose building line sits back from the road side by a further distance than No.11. The obscure glazed windows will not cause a loss of privacy or overlooking to No.13 & 15.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 17/01968/FULL6 and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and / or drawings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: 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.

- 3 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.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

- 4 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window(s) shall be obscure glazed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

This page is left intentionally blank

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/02002/FULL1

Ward:
Kelsey And Eden Park

Address : 21 Langley Road Beckenham BR3 4AE

OS Grid Ref: E: 536054 N: 168244

Applicant : Mr Michael Gerrard

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

The demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a part one/two-storey side/rear extension to create a new 1 bedroom dwelling.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 15

Proposal

The application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a part one/two storey extension in order to create a new 1 bedroom 2 person dwelling. Off-street parking for one vehicle would be provided to the front of the property.

The application relates to three-storey late C19th detached property, which is located on the east side of Langley Road. There is an existing single-storey detached garage located to the side of the property and a generous sized rear garden. The applicant indicates the existing building operates as a House of Multiple Occupation (HMO), however the existing floor plans show a number of units, which appear to be self-contained. The front of the property benefits from off-street parking.

The site is bounded by residential properties and their gardens to the north and west. To the south is Staddon Close, which leads to a small residential development.

The site is not located within a conservation area and there are no Tree Preservation Orders on the site but a number of large trees surround the southern and eastern boundaries. The site is located within a mixed residential area.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- The development will increase the existing parking problems. Parking street is already high on Langley Road. The survey doesn't take into account the rhythms of car use and new stresses on street.
- The recent internal conversions of No 21 into 6 bedsits and the rear extension, into 2 flats has already resulted in a substantial amount of new parking need on this street. Combined with the nursery drop-off and pick up time and local primary school the area is over stresses.
- Road already has parking problems, cannot park anywhere near house and people part over neighbouring drives.
- Bromley parking wardens have already been called to solve a number of parking disputes
- Will make the street more unsafe for children and other pedestrians
- Traditional look of the building would be ruined.
- Road is too narrow and additional builders vans and cars will result in congestion
- Demolition of the garage may harm neighbouring properties
- Dust and debris
- Noise and disruption during building works
- Loss of privacy
- Harm neighbouring amenities
- Noise pollution from access arrangements and position of entrance
- 1m side space is inadequate for privacy
- Cramped overdevelopment
- The existing cottages appear to be original to the larger building to which they are attached and are not later additions.
- This building will always be a contemporary design that will appear bulky and disjointed. Jeopardising the traditional appearance of the neighbouring buildings.
- Will feel cramped
- The garage forms the boundary and ensures privacy and security. It also hides the large new extension at No 21.
- No 21 has been converted and there is an increase in the number of residents in the property.

Highway - The site is currently a house in multiple occupations. There is no information on the number of occupants of this dwelling or the associated car ownership of the residents.

There is an existing garage, drive and front garden, which could possibly accommodate up to 3 vehicles parked off-street. Only 1 off-street space is being proposed for the existing dwelling, potentially displacing 2 cars to parking on-street.

The site is in a location with a PTAL rating of 4 (moderate) where, in ordinary circumstances, a degree of car ownership could be expected to be associated with occupiers of the building. However, experience suggests that occupiers of such accommodation tend not to own cars to the same degree as would otherwise be the case.

Langley Road is a one-way street, is not subject to waiting restrictions, except for short lengths at its northern end and across the junction with Staddon Close (the latter suggesting that on-street parking had caused access issues in the past), and on-street car parking appears to be common on both sides of the street. However, due to it being a one-way street such parking would appear not to be an issue in terms of the free flow of traffic and conditions of safety in the street.

The application site is around 350m from Elmer's End Station and the bus terminus and stops and could be a popular parking destination for commuters as well as residents. It is thus likely that there is little or no spare capacity for further on-street parking.

1 car parking space and cycle parking are included in the proposal for the new dwelling as well as the single car parking space for the existing.

There is no car parking standards for the current use of no. 21. For comparison, the UDP recommends 0.5 spaces per unit for social-rented affordable housing. Ideally a site-specific assessment of car ownership is needed to inform this, but as a broad brush approach, it might be appropriate to consider 0.3 spaces per unit as an appropriate level for this type of accommodation. However, no information has been provided regarding the current number of occupants of no. 21 or the level of car ownership associated with those residents.

A recent parking stress survey has been carried out which shows that the day time situation is close to saturation point (95.7% in Langley Road, 94.4% in Goddard Road and 100% in Shirley Crescent) with only 5 spaces available on the day of the survey. As the level of parking is close to saturation (on another day it may be even closer or at saturation point) and with another development at no. 24 having the potential to add to demand there is scope to consider refusal of this application (and that for no. 24) on highway grounds.

Highways - Additional comments: Car ownership can be around 0.5 spaces per bedroom for such accommodation. I thus consider that, without a more detailed assessment of car ownership for this site than the agent doesn't envisage residents will own cars, more consideration needs to be given to providing off-street parking for the existing HMO. We still haven't been advised of the number of occupants of 21 in order to take a view on the potential scale of the potential parking demand.

Drainage - Please impose condition D02 (surface water drainage) if minded to approve.

Environmental Health - No objections

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development

BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure
H1 Housing Supply
H7 Housing Density and Design
H9 Side Space
NE7 Development and Trees
ER10 Light pollution
T3 Parking
T7 Cyclists
T11 New Accesses
T18 Road Safety

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) documents are also a consideration in the determination of planning applications. These are:

SPG No.1 - General Design Principles
SPG No.2 - Residential Design Guidance

London Plan (2016)

Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply.
Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.10 Urban greening
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.15 Reducing and Managing Noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature
Policy 7.21 Trees and Woodlands
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (2015)

DCLG: Technical Housing Standards (2015)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) - Relevant chapters include Chapters 6, 7, 11, 12.

Draft Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State will be in mid-2017.

Policy 1 Housing Supply
Policy 3 Backland and Garden Land Development
Policy 4 Housing Design
Policy 8 Side Space
Policy 30 Parking
Policy 32 Road Safety
Policy 37 General Design of Development
Policy 73 Development and Trees
Policy 79 Biodiversity and Access to Nature
Policy 115 Reducing Flood Risk
Policy 116 Sustainable Urban Drainage
Policy 119 Noise Pollution
Policy 122 Light Pollution
Policy 123 Sustainable Design and Construction Planning History

16/05507/HHPA- Single storey rear extension, extending beyond the rear wall of the original house by 8m, for which the maximum height would be 3.625m, and for which the height of the eaves would be 2.580m. (42 Day Notification for Householder Permitted Development Prior Approval) Approval not required
04.01.2017

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the principle of development, impact of the proposed works on the character and appearance of the area, standard of proposed accommodation, neighbouring amenity and highway issues.

Principle of Development

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states in Paragraph 49 that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The NPPF sets out in paragraph 14 a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of decision-making, the document states that where a development accords with a local plan, applications should be approved without delay. Where a plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

The document also encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) and excludes gardens from the definition of previously developed land.

Policy H7 of the UDP sets out criteria to assess whether new housing developments is appropriate subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining and future residential occupiers of the scheme, car parking and traffic implications, community safety and refuse arrangements.

The site is situated within a residential location and the Council will consider new residential development provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides for garden and amenity space. Any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, conservation and historic issues, biodiversity or open space will need to be addressed.

Therefore the principle of an additional dwelling is subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining and future residential occupiers of the scheme, car parking, traffic implications and refuses arrangements.

Design, siting and layout

Policy BE1 and the Council's Supplementary design guidance seek to ensure that new development, are of a high quality design that respects the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development. This includes consideration of gaps between dwellings, when they contribute to the character of the area.

The development would involve the demolition of an existing side garage and the construction of one bedroom dwelling in its place. It would adjoin No 21 and has been designed to have the appearance of a pitched roof side extension to the host property with a front gable feature, similar materials, and would also set back from its front main elevation. It would however incorporate a small two-storey rear projection and a significant ground floor extension.

No 17, 19 and 21 Langley Road share similar proportions and architectural detailing. However, it is noted that No 17 & 19 benefit from two-storey pitched roof side additions, which are set back from the front elevations. Each of the side additions have been severed from the main dwellings and converted into self-contained units, however these severed units retain a significant degree of subservience. When looking at the dwellings from the street these side additions are situated to the right hand side of the properties, whereas the proposal would be contained to the left. Whilst this would disrupt the established rhythm to a degree, this is not considered to be significantly harmful due to its sympathetic design approach. Similar side additions are also noted on neighbouring properties on the opposite side of the road. The neighbouring properties at 17 & 19 are characterised by sub-divided plots. The proposed arrangement would not therefore be out of character with these neighbouring examples. A minimum of 1m side

space would also be retained between the flank wall of the development and side boundary. This therefore complies with the requirements of Policy H9. The extension would appear sufficiently subservient and the narrowing of the space between the dwellings would not result in undue harm to the special standards of the streetscene.

Standard of accommodation

The London Plan and London Plan Housing SPG, together with the DCLG Technical Housing Standards set out minimum floor space standards for dwellings of different sizes.

The proposal would provide a dwelling with a GIA of around 62sqm. This meets the minimum standard of 58sqm for a 1bedroom 2 person dwelling.

All rooms would achieve a satisfactory level of light and outlook. A small area of privacy amenity space would be provided at the rear.

Neighbouring amenity

The proposed dwelling would be situated between No 19A and 21 Langley Road. Number 19A is located to the north of the application site and has not been extended at the rear. This property is situated within the side addition at No 19. The proposal would sit adjacent to this neighbour but would be set back from the common boundary by 1m.

The main bulk of the proposed dwelling would be two-storey in height but its scale is modest; incorporating a rear gable with low eaves. Its form replicates the proportions of No 19A but it would also include single-storey at the rear. The proposed two-storey element of the dwelling would mirror the rear building line of No 19A. The single-storey extension would then project beyond the rear of this neighbouring property for 5.7m. At present, the existing garage forms the boundary wall separating the application site with the garden of 19A. The proposed single-storey element would be similar in depth to the existing garage structure but would be marginally lower in height. It is noted that the existing garage has already resulted in a degree of visual incursion and its replacement with a similar sized rear projection would not result in a level of visual harm - in terms of visual dominance, outlook or loss of light/overshadowing - which significantly worse than the established situation. The two-storey element of the proposal would however infill the space between the dwellings to a greater degree, but the bulk of the existing dwelling has already resulted in some overshadowing. This would not be significantly exacerbated by the proposed development as the two-storey element of the proposal would not project beyond the rear of No 19A. Furthermore, the location of the existing garage, and its boundary height, has afforded No 19A a level of privacy from No 21. The location of the dwelling and relationship with the boundary would result in some additional overlooking into the rear garden however the first floor rear window would serve a bathroom and could be conditioned to be obscured glazed and non-opening. The impact on the visual amenities of No 19A are therefore considered to be on balance acceptable.

The proposal would also abut the shared boundary with No 21. The applicant states this property is also used as a HMO. It has recently been extended by way of an 8m single-storey rear extension. The proposal would adjoin this property but would not extend beyond the rear elevation of this rear extension. This relationship would prevent any unacceptable loss of light and outlook, or be harmful by way of an overbearing impact.

The impact on the visual amenities of neighbouring properties therefore considered to be on balance acceptable.

Highways

The proposal would result in the demolition of the existing garage. At present there is the potential to accommodate up to three cars off-street. The development would provide one parking space for the new dwelling and one for the existing HMO, potentially displacing two vehicles, however the existing garage does appear to be small. The site has a PTAL of 4 and is within walking distance of a number of bus stops, a train station and local services. Langley Road is a one-way street and is not subject to waiting restrictions, except for short lengths at its northern end and across the junction with Staddon Close. The application is supported by a parking survey which shows that the day time situation is close to saturation point (95.7% in Langley Road, 94.4% in Goddard Road and 100% in Shirley Crescent) with only 5 spaces available on the day of the survey. Limited information has also been provided about the occupancy of the HMO and the associated car ownership, however the agent has stated that it is not envisaged that any of the residents in the HMO will have cars. The Council's Highways officer has raised concerns with the level of parking provision and potential for displacement of vehicles causing increased on-street parking demand. However, the proposed unit would be create a 1 bedroom dwelling and two spaces for the both the unit and HMO would be provided off street.

It is noted that an application for a new three bed residential dwelling (17/02008/FULL1) immediately to the rear of No 24, which is located on the opposite side of the road was refused, in part, due to inadequate parking provision, resulting in increased on street parking pressure. However, this application related to larger proposed residential dwelling (three beds) and a larger HMO (No 24). Given the size of the proposed dwelling (1bed) and proximity of the train station/services Members may consider that the parking provision in this case is on balance acceptable.

Conclusion

It is considered that the dwelling would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene or area in general. The standard of accommodation is considered to be acceptable and there would also be no undue harm to neighbouring residential amenities. In relation to the highway impact the proposal would have the potential to result in some additional on-street parking demand, but given the PTAL, size of the proposed unit and acceptability of the scheme in all other respects, Members may consider the scheme to be on balance acceptable.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 17/02002/FULL1 and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

REASON: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.**

REASON: 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.

- 3 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.**

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

- 4 Before commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted parking spaces and/or garages and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (England) 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.**

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

- 5 The arrangements for storage of refuse (which shall include provision for the storage and collection of recyclable materials) and the means of enclosure shown on the approved drawings shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate refuse storage facilities in a location which is acceptable from the residential and visual amenity aspects.

- 6 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include measures of how construction traffic can access the site safely and how potential traffic conflicts can be minimised; the route construction traffic shall follow for arriving at and leaving the site and the hours of operation, but shall not be limited to these. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T5, T6, T7, T15, T16 & T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 7 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied boundary enclosures of a height and type to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be erected in such positions along the boundaries of the site(s) as shall be approved and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of visual amenity and the amenities of adjacent properties.

- 8 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed window(s) in the upper floor rear elevation shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy Level 3 and 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 and the window (s) shall subsequently be permanently retained in accordance as such.

REASON: In the interests of the amenities of nearby residential properties and to accord with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan

- 9 Details of a surface water drainage system (including storage facilities where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the

development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved system shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage and to accord with Policy 5.12 of the London Plan

This page is left intentionally blank

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/02203/FULL1

Ward:
Bromley Common And
Keston

Address : Land At Chantry Lane Bromley

OS Grid Ref: E: 541652 N: 167908

Applicant : Mr Wayne Duck

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Construction of a part one/two storey business unit (Use Class B1).

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 19

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a part one/two storey business unit (Use Class B1) on a currently vacant plot directly to the rear of No22 Bloomfield Road of which the land appears to have been part of the rear curtilage previously.

The proposal involves a two storey section of building at 5.75m height being located centrally within the footprint of the building at approximately 2.7m to the rear boundary. The remainder of the building will be single storey at 4m height adjoining the boundary with No22 Bloomfield Road to the rear and the flank boundaries of the site. South east of the site, the building is indicated to be adjacent to a small two storey building within the rear curtilage of 28-30 Chatterton Road.

The unit has been laid out to offer maximum flexibility of use to potential occupants with a larger ground floor area and a smaller ancillary area at first floor level. A roller shutter adjoining Chantry Lane would allow vehicular access into the building from Chantry Lane. A separate pedestrian entrance leads up to the indicated ancillary mezzanine office space.

Location

The site directly abuts Chantry Lane without a footway and is located to the rear of 22 Bloomfield Road. This part of Chantry Lane is unmade and is accessed from Chatterton Road, a Local Neighbourhood Centre. Surrounding the property there are a number of commercial enterprises. The site is not in a conservation area.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

Internal Consultations

Highways

Note: The Highways Officer has provided the same comments as per the previous application which was approved.

The application site is currently vacant and as such it would seem likely that it has no pedestrian/vehicular trips associated with it. The proposal is for B1 use and no assessment of the likely level of trips associated with the proposal has been submitted.

The site is located on Chantry Lane, a narrow unadopted road, where vehicles servicing the site would be likely to obstruct Chantry Lane and where additional pedestrian movements are undesirable due to the narrowness of the road, its condition (i.e. unadopted highway) and the absence of a footway.

This application should, therefore, be supported by a Transport Statement assessing the suitability of the site location for the proposed use both in terms of servicing requirements and pedestrian movement. This should include the local parking situation and public transport accessibility. One parking space is required.

Drainage

Further detail regarding drainage details recommended via planning condition.

Environmental Health - Pollution:

In principle, no objections to permission being granted. There are a number of motor vehicle related businesses in the vicinity and therefore it is suggested that a condition be imposed which would limit the hours of operation so that they were similar to adjacent operations.

Planning Considerations

Relevant policies and guidance in the form of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) include:

- 14: Achieving sustainable development
- 17: Principles of planning
- 20 to 22: building a strong, competitive economy
- 29 to 32, 35 to 37: Promoting sustainable transport
- 56 to 66: Design of development

London Plan

- 4.1 Developing London's Economy
- 4.4 Managing industrial land and premises
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
- 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
- 5.7 Renewable Energy
- 5.10 Urban Greening
- 5.11 Green Roofs and Development Site Environs
- 5.12 Flood Risk Management
- 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
- 5.14 Water quality and wastewater Infrastructure
- 5.15 Water use and supplies
- 5.16 Waste self-sufficiency
- 5.17 Waste capacity
- 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
- 5.21 Contaminated land
- 6.3 Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity
- 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
- 6.9 Cycling
- 6.12 Road Network Capacity.
- 6.13 Parking
- 7.2 An Inclusive Environment
- 7.3 Designing Out Crime
- 7.4 Local Character
- 7.5 Public Realm
- 7.6 Architecture
- 7.14 Improving Air Quality
- 7.15 Reducing and Managing Noise, Improving and Enhancing the Acoustic Environment and Promoting Appropriate Soundscapes.
- 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

Unitary Development Plan:

- BE1 Design of New Development
- BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure
- EMP6 Development outside of Business areas
- ER7 Contaminated Land
- T1 Transport Demand
- T2 Assessment of Transport Effects
- T3 Parking
- T5 Access for People with Restricted Mobility
- T6 Pedestrians
- T7 Cyclists
- T16 Traffic Management and Sensitive Environments
- T17 Servicing of Premises
- T18 Road Safety

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1: General Design Principles

Emerging Bromley Local Plan:

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the draft Local Plan will be to the Secretary of State in mid 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 30 - Parking

Draft Policy 31 - Relieving Congestion

Draft Policy 32 - Road Safety

Draft Policy 33 - Access for All

Draft Policy 34 - Highway Infrastructure Provision

Draft Policy 37 - General design of development

Draft Policy 73 - Development and Trees

Draft Policy 77 - Landscape Quality and Character

Draft Policy 83 - Non Designated Employment Land

Draft Policy 112 - Planning for Sustainable Waste management

Draft Policy 113 - Waste Management in New Development

Draft Policy 115 - Reducing flood risk

Draft Policy 116 - Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)

Draft Policy 117- Water and Wastewater Infrastructure Capacity

Draft Policy 118 - Contaminated Land

Draft Policy 119 - Noise Pollution

Draft Policy 120 - Air Quality

Draft Policy 122 - Light Pollution

Draft Policy 123 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Draft Policy 124 - Carbon dioxide reduction, Decentralise Energy networks and Renewable Energy

Planning History

15/02046/FULL1: New small business unit (Use Class B1). Refused 26.11.2015.

Refusal reason: The proposed building by reason of its height, depth and bulk would represent a cramped overdevelopment of the site, detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the amenities of nearby residents in Bloomfield Road and Chatterton Road contrary to Policy BE1 of the UDP

16/01728/FULL1: Construction of a part one/two storey business unit (Use Class B1). Approved 20.06.2016.

Conclusions

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- Principle of development
- The design and appearance of the scheme and the impact of these alterations on the character and appearance of the locality
- Access, highways and traffic Issues
- Impact on adjoining properties

Principle of Development

Policy EMP6 details that outside designated Business Areas the Council will only permit non-conforming business uses where there would be no significant adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding properties. This approach is reiterated in Draft Policy 83 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan.

Given the context of the mixed residential and commercial uses in the immediate vicinity the provision of a small business use on this site is considered acceptable subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining and future residential occupiers of the scheme, car parking and traffic implications, sustainable design and energy, community safety and service/refuse arrangements.

Design and Layout

Policy BE1 sets out a number of criteria for the design of new development. With regard to local character and appearance development should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. Development should not detract from the existing street scene and/or landscape and should respect important views, skylines, landmarks or landscape features. Space about buildings should provide opportunities to create attractive settings with hard or soft landscaping and relationships with existing buildings should allow for adequate daylight and sunlight to penetrate in and between buildings.

The current proposal represents a revised submission to the previously approved scheme which itself followed a refused scheme with a significantly reduced scale of building.

The current scheme incorporates a footprint that now occupies the whole site area. This has removed a 2m separation gap previously introduced to the rear boundary. The height of the rear wall has also been increased to 4m. However, an approximate distance of 12.5m between the single storey rear elevation and the rear elevation of No22 Bloomfield Road remains as previously approved.

At the upper level the floor area is limited to approximately 50% of the footprint of the building. The upper level is now situated centrally and is positioned away from

all the boundaries and is approximately 14m from the rear elevations of No's 24/26 Chatterton Road and 14.5m from the rear elevation of No22 Bloomfield Road.

Therefore, the further revised scheme although of a marginally larger scale at ground level which is offset by a repositioned central upper level continues to provide a balanced design solution to the site that takes account of the scale and proximity of surrounding development.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan states that development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and ensure they are not harmed by noise disturbance, inadequate daylight, sunlight, and privacy or overshadowing.

In terms of the scale of the building it is considered that the height and mass will not be overly dominant and overbearing to the outlook from the rear habitable room windows of the properties of Bloomfield Road and Chatterton Road. A window shown on the upper level rear elevation is indicated as obscure glazed. This can be conditioned to remain in perpetuity.

In terms of noise and disturbance, the majority of properties along Bloomfield Road appear to have subdivided their land for commercial uses along Chantry Lane. It is noted that no objection has been raised from the Environmental Health Officer in respect of any significant increase in the level of noise. However, in terms of general disturbance in a predominantly residential area, the level of commercial activity will increase which will change the residential character to a greater mixed business/ residential character. Given the predominance of residential use adjacent and the additional business use, the effect of the increased use of a business on site is likely to have some level of effect on the residential character of the area and general amenity of occupiers of surrounding properties. To offset these impacts in the vicinity it is considered that limiting the use of the unit to B1 only and control of the hours of operation of a future occupier will help control a business use on site in the interests of nearby residential occupiers.

Highways and Traffic Issues

London Plan and UDP Policies encourage sustainable transport modes whilst recognising the need for appropriate parking provision. Car parking standards within the London Plan should be used as a basis for assessment.

The Councils Highway Officer has commented that Chantry Lane is a narrow unadopted road, where vehicles servicing the site would be likely to obstruct Chantry Lane and where additional pedestrian movements are undesirable due to the narrowness of the road, its condition and the absence of a footway.

On balance, given there are a number of other commercial premises along Chantry Lane, it is not considered that there would be a significant impact upon the highway. Furthermore, roller shutter doors allows a vehicle or vehicles to be parked inside the buildings if required by a future occupant.

Nevertheless it is recommended that a planning condition is attached with any permission to request a Transport Statement prior to commencement of works to assess the site location for the proposed use both in terms of servicing arrangements and pedestrian movement to and from the site for staff and customers to include the local parking situation and public transport accessibility.

Summary

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the siting, scale and design of the building and associated works is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area. Subject to further information to be obtained by condition the addition the small business unit is not considered to cause increased congestion in principle or conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 17/02203/FULL1 and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 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.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

- 3 Details of all external materials, including roof cladding, wall facing materials and cladding, window glass, door and window frames, decorative features, rainwater goods and paving where appropriate, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: 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

- 4 No development shall commence on site until a Transport Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Transport Statement shall assess the local parking situation and public transport accessibility, the servicing requirements and pedestrian movement to and from the site and include measures to alleviate the transport impact of the development. The measures specified in the approved details shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and shall be adhered to in perpetuity.**

Reason: In order to ensure appropriate management of transport implications of the development and to accord with Policy T2 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 6.12 and 6.13 of the London Plan.

- 5 The development permitted by this planning permission shall not commence until a surface water drainage scheme and details of general drainage works for the site based on sustainable drainage principles, and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro geological context of the development has been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage strategy should seek to implement a SUDS hierarchy that achieves reductions in surface water run-off rates to Greenfield rates in line with the Preferred Standard of the Mayor's London Plan.**

Reason: To reduce the impact of flooding both to and from the proposed development and third parties and to accord with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

- 6 Details of arrangements for storage of refuse and recyclable materials (including means of enclosure for the area concerned where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved arrangements shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate refuse storage facilities in a location which is acceptable from the residential and visual amenity aspects.

- 7 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided at the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning**

Authority, and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 6.9 of the London Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

- 8 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include measures of how construction traffic can access the site safely and how potential traffic conflicts can be minimised; the route construction traffic shall follow for arriving at and leaving the site and the hours of operation, but shall not be limited to these. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T5, T6, T7, T15, T16 & T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 9 Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the premises shall be used for Use Class B1 and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class B of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order).**

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining property and the area generally and to comply with Policies BE1 and EMP6 of the Unitary Development Plan

- 10 The premises shall only be open for customer business or operational between the hours of 07.00 and 19.00 Monday to Saturday nor at any time on Sundays and Bank Holidays.**

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining property at unsociable periods and to comply with Policies BE1 and EMP6 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 11 No mechanical or noise generating operations shall take place outside of the building shown on drawing R.502**

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining property and the area generally and to comply with Policies BE1 and EMP6 of the Unitary Development Plan.

12 Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no extension or alteration of the building shall take place without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties and to comply with Policies BE1 and EMP6 of the Unitary Development Plan.

13 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the window in the rear elevation of the building shall be obscure glazed in accordance with details (including the means and extent of opening) to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

You are further informed that:

1 The applicant is advised that any works associated with the implementation of this permission (including the demolition of any existing buildings or structures) will constitute commencement of development. Further, all pre commencement conditions attached to this permission must be discharged, by way of a written approval in the form of an application to the Planning Authority, before any such works of demolition take place.

2 Before works commence, the Applicant is advised to contact the Pollution Team of Environmental Health & Trading Standards regarding compliance with the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and/or the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Applicant should also ensure compliance with the Control of Pollution and Noise from Demolition and Construction Sites Code of Practice 2008 which is available on the Bromley web site.

3 If during the works on site any suspected contamination is encountered, Environmental Health should be contacted immediately. The contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Authority for approval in writing.

4 You should consult the Land Charges and Street Naming/Numbering Section at the Civic Centre on 020 8313 4742 or e-mail: address.management@bromley.gov.uk regarding Street Naming and

Numbering. Fees and application forms are available on the Council's website at www.bromley.gov.uk

This page is left intentionally blank

Section '3' – Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT

Application No : 17/02290/OUT

Ward:
Bromley Town

Address : 100 Madeira Avenue Bromley BR1 4AS

OS Grid Ref: E: 539333 N: 170245

Applicant : South East Living Group

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a three storey terrace comprising 2 three bedroom and 1 four bedroom houses with integral garages, access onto Madeira Avenue and associated landscaping OUTLINE APPLICATION

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 3

Proposal

Outline planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing dwelling at No. 100 Madeira Avenue and the erection of three terraced three storey dwellings. Two of the dwelling will have three bedrooms and one will have four bedrooms. The proposal includes vehicle access onto Madeira Avenue to provide car parking and landscaping to the front and individual rear gardens will be provided.

The applicant has provided an illustrative plan that indicates that the proposed building will have a height of 11.4m and a width of 16.4m. The building will have a length of 14.9m. The roof will be pitched with an eaves height of 8.6m. The building will retain a side space of 1.15m to the northern flank boundary and 1.7m to the southern flank boundary.

The proposal is for outline planning permission, with access and layout being the reserved matter for which approval is sought. Details of appearance, landscaping and scale are reserved for future detailed consideration.

Location

The site is located on the eastern side of Madeira Avenue and comprises a detached two storey dwelling. The topography of the site slopes steeply downhill from rear to front and the wider area is characterised by a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellings with a variety of architectural styles and heights. The site is covered by a Tree Preservation Order.

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- Insufficient space for parking in front of garages which would increase on-street parking and traffic issues on Madeira Avenue. Impractical garages proposed.
- Loss of unique character of existing building. Replacement building would be out of character.
- Overdevelopment of the site and excessive bulk. Building line of the road would not be respected.
- Dominant and overbearing form of development and lowering of spatial standards of the road.
- Loss of local character – existing building has merit and should be retained whilst the new building would not reflect local character.
- Disruption and further traffic issues as a result of the construction works and increase in number of houses at the site.
- Loss of on-street parking along the frontage of the site, impacting on parking on the road.
- The proposed development of the roof space adds an extra level of windows. Coupled with the proposed forwarding of the building's footprint, which is already intrusive, this would also be a gross invasion of privacy for the houses across the road. It would mean that there would be a clear view into bedrooms and those of my neighbours. This contravenes aspects of Article 8 of The European Convention on Human Rights.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking of neighbouring residential properties.
- Loss of light and overshadowing.
- Noise, disturbance and possible damage to cars as a result of the construction works. Construction conditions should be imposed.
- The serious amount of excavation needed has serious implications for the safety of the foundations of the neighbouring properties and for the proposed property itself.
- Impact on trees at the site.

Consultations

Highways – Madeira Avenue is not subject to waiting restrictions in this vicinity and accommodates on-street parking without significant detriment to the free flow of traffic or conditions of safety in the highway. Although there appears to be a high demand for on-street parking in the vicinity of the application site and so there is likely to be some displacement of on-street parking demand to accommodate the proposed additional 2 crossovers. However, this is unlikely to have any significant impact in respect of highway considerations. The site location has a PTAL rating of 1a (low) where car ownership would be expected to be associated with the occupiers of the properties and where up to 2 parking spaces per unit would be desirable. The proposal is to provide integral garages and drives for each property and thus offer 2 off-street parking spaces per unit. Refuse and cycle storage is indicated to be within the garages. There are no highway objections to the principle of this proposal.

Environmental Health (Housing) – no comments received.

Environmental Health (Pollution) – no objections raised subject to standard informatives.

Drainage – no comments received. A standard drainage condition can be imposed to ensure satisfactory drainage of the site.

Thames Water – no comments received.

Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

Chapter 4 Promoting Sustainable Transport
Chapter 6 Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes
Chapter 7 Requiring Good Design

The following London Plan policies are also a material consideration:

3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
3.5 Design and Quality of Housing Developments
3.8 Housing Choice
5.1 Climate Change
5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
6.9 Cycling
6.13 Parking
7.4 Local Character
7.6 Architecture

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

BE1 Design of Development
H1 Housing Supply
H7 Housing Density and Design
H9 Side Space
T1 Transport Demand
T2 Assessment of Transport Effects
T3 Parking
T7 Cyclists
T18 Road Safety
NE7 Development and Trees

Emerging Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and the final consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). The updated Local Development Scheme was submitted to Development Control Committee on November 24th 2016 and Executive Committee on November 30th 2016, and indicated the submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State in mid-2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 1 – Housing Supply
Draft Policy 4 – Housing Design
Draft Policy 8 – Side Space

Draft Policy 30 - Parking
Draft Policy 32 – Highways Safety
Draft Policy 37 – General Design of Development
Draft Policy 73 – Development and Trees
Draft Policy 116 – Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)
Draft Policy 123 – Sustainable Design and Construction

Other Guidance

Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (March 2016)

Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standard (March 2015)

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 – General Design Principles
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 – Residential Design Guidance

Planning History

Planning permission was refused under ref. 06/00093 for demolition of existing dwellings and erection of 6 four storey four bedroom townhouses with integral garages, car parking and landscaping (100 and 102 Madeira Avenue). The refusal grounds were as follows:

‘The proposed development would be out of character with the general pattern of development in the area, and would constitute a cramped overdevelopment of the site, by reason of the size, height and massing of the building, which would be detrimental to the spatial standards of the street scene and out of character with the surrounding area, thereby contrary to Policies H.2 and E.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policies H6 and BE1 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan (September 2002).

The development in the manner proposed, and in particular the bulk of the building and the front facing balconies, would have a seriously detrimental effect on the amenities of nearby residents by reason of loss of prospect and privacy, and would be contrary to Policies H.2 and E.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policies H6 and BE1 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan (September 2002).’

Planning permission was refused under ref. 05/02468 for demolition of existing dwellings and erection of 4 storey block comprising 14 two bedroom flats with 12 undercroft and 9 open parking spaces, associated bin store and cycle parking and terraced garden at rear (at 100 and 102 Madeira Avenue). The refusal grounds were as follows:

‘The proposed flatted development would be out of character with the general pattern of development in the area, and would constitute a cramped overdevelopment of the site, by reason of the number of units proposed, the size, height and massing of the building, and the lack of adequate car parking provision and amenity space, which would be detrimental to the spatial standards of the street scene and out of character with the surrounding area, thereby contrary to Policies H.2 and E.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policies H6 and BE1 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan (September 2002).

The proposed building, by reason of its size, height and depth of rearward projection, would have a seriously detrimental effect on the amenities of nearby residents through loss of light, privacy and outlook, and would be contrary to Policies H.2 and E.1 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policies H6 and BE1 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan (September 2002).

The proposed undercroft and surface parking area is inadequate in both layout and number of spaces provided to meet the Council's standards, and the proposals are, therefore, likely to lead to increased pressure for parking in nearby roads, which would be detrimental to the free flow of traffic and conditions of safety in the highway, thereby contrary to Policy T.15 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policy T3 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan (September 2002).'

Conclusion

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties. The impact on highway safety and the standard of accommodation provided for future occupants are also considerations.

Impact on the Character of the Area

Housing is a priority use for all London Boroughs. Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply, Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential and Policy 3.8 Housing Choice in the London Plan (2015) generally encourage the provision of redevelopment in previously developed residential areas provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides for garden and amenity space.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states in Paragraph 49 that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

Policy BE1 of the UDP requires new buildings to complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas, and seeks to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Policy H7 requires the design of new residential development to be of a high quality and to recognise as well as complement the qualities of the surrounding areas. Density ranges should be compliant with the Technical Housing Standards and levels of residential amenity should be compliant with the London Plan.

Madeira Avenue is characterised by a mix of residential properties, including detached, semi-detached and terraced housing. There are also townhouse dwellings with a three storey appearance further to the north of the site on the eastern side of the road (Nos. 114-124). The proposal seeks to demolish the single detached dwelling at No. 100 and replace it with a row of 3 terraced dwellings. Whilst the existing building is attractive in its design, it is not Statutory or Locally Listed and is not considered that its demolition would result in the loss of a significantly important building or be detrimental to local character. It is considered that the principle of the replacement proposed would be considered acceptable in light of the local character and the mix of development style on Madeira Avenue.

The proposed replacement building will retain a suitable side space to the flank boundaries of the site in order to respect the spatial standards of the area in this regard. The height of the building will exceed that of Nos. 98 and 102, however the use of a pitched roof design will focus this additional height away from the boundaries and therefore the building is considered to read sympathetically in the street scene without dominating the neighbouring dwellings. The height of the building will be marginally lower than the maximum height of the existing building. The proposed building will be sited in a manner that respects the established building line and would not appear to be prominent within the street scene due to the ample set back from the highway.

On balance it is considered that the style, layout and density of the development would complement the mixed character of Madeira Avenue and would not detract from the established form, layout and character of the area. The proposal would therefore comply with Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies 4 and 37 of the emerging Local Plan.

Residential Density

Table 3.2 of the London Plan outlines suitable residential density figures throughout London, subject to setting and public transport accessibility. Within a suburban location such as this, with a PTAL rating of 1a, a residential density of 35-55 units per hectare would be expected for this type of large residential development, where the average number of habitable rooms per unit is 3.8-4.6.

The site has an approximate area of 0.09 hectares. The provision of 3 units would therefore result in a site density of 33.3 units per hectare. As the density standards should not be applied mechanistically, this marginal shortfall is considered to be broadly suitable for the site, given the PTAL rating and wider local character.

Amount and Standard of Accommodation

Table 3.2 of Policy 3.4 (Optimising Housing Potential) of the London Plan (2015) gives an indicative level of density for new housing developments, and in this instance, the proposal represents a density of 42 dwellings per hectare with the table giving a suggested level of between 40-80 dwellings per hectare in a suburban area with a 4 PTAL location. The proposals would therefore result in an intensity of use of the site that would be within the thresholds in the London Plan. However, the proposal needs to be assessed against the wider context in terms of the character, spatial standards and townscape value of the surrounding area.

Policy 3.5 of the London Plan and the Housing SPG (2016) states the minimum internal floorspace required for residential units on the basis of the level of occupancy that could be reasonably expected within each unit should comply with Nationally Described Housing Standards (2015).

A three bedroom five person house over three storeys would require a GIA of 99 square metres and a four bedroom six person house 112 square metres. The proposal would create residential dwellings that would have a GIA that comfortably exceeds this minimum. It is therefore considered that the dwellings would provide a suitable standard of accommodation for future occupants in accordance with the DCLG Technical Housing Standards (2015). It is also considered that the proposed room sizes would meet the minimum standards in respect to GIA and minimum width. The proposed bedrooms will have a GIA of between 11m² and 23m². The Technical Housing Standards require 11.5m² for a double bedroom and 7.5m² for a single bedroom. The bedrooms would meet the required 2.75m width requirement for a double

bedroom size and 2.15m for the single bedroom. The proposal would provide ample private amenity spaces at the rear and would therefore provide a suitable standard of accommodation for future occupants.

Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenities

The proposed dwelling would respect the building line of this part of Madeira Avenue, however it would project 6m to the rear of No. 102 at lower and upper ground floor level. The development would present a three storey flank wall to No. 102 with a separation of 2.9m. The set back at first floor and roof level means that the building would project 3.5m to the rear of No. 102 at first floor level. The first floor and roof will be sited approximately 1m closer to the flank boundary than the existing two storey structure and whilst this would create some degree of further shadowing, the relationship with No. 102 is considered to be acceptable in this regard. As the lower ground floor aspect of the scheme will be sited on a low land level relative to No. 102, this aspect of the proposal would not impact on the outlook from the neighbouring rear windows. The upper ground floor would project 6m however the roof would not exceed the height of the existing boundary fence. The first floor will be set back with a rear projection of 3.5m relative to the rear wall of No. 102. The proposal would also create a separation to the flank boundary that does not at present exist by removing the existing building which adjoins the northern side boundary. In addition there are no flank windows at No. 102 that would be affected and on balance it is considered that the proposal would respect the amenities of No. 102 in light of the low roof height of the upper ground floor, separation to the boundary and stepped design at upper floor level.

To the south, the siting of the building will respect both the front and rear building line of No. 98 and will not project significantly either to the front or rear of this house. This particular relationship is considered to be acceptable as no loss of sunlight or visual impact would result. No. 98 possesses one first floor flank window that is obscurely glazed and serves a bathroom.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would respect the amenities of neighbouring properties and would comply with Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies 4 and 37 of the emerging Local Plan.

Parking and Highway Safety

The Residential Car Parking Standards prescribe up to 2 car parking spaces per unit for large residential developments in a low PTAL area. Each dwelling will be provided with an integral garage and additional car parking space to the front of the building.

Madeira Avenue is not subject to waiting restrictions in this vicinity and accommodates on-street parking without significant detriment to the free flow of traffic or conditions of safety in the highway. Although there appears to be a high demand for on-street parking in the vicinity of the application site and so there is likely to be some displacement of on-street parking demand to accommodate the proposed additional 2 crossovers. However, this is unlikely to have any significant impact in respect of highway considerations.

The site location has a PTAL rating of 1a (low) where car ownership would be expected to be associated with the occupiers of the properties and where up to 2 parking spaces per unit would be desirable.

The proposal is to provide integral garages and drives for each property and thus offer 2 off-street parking spaces per unit. Refuse and cycle storage is indicated to be within the garages. There are no highway objections to the principle of this proposal.

Other Considerations

The site has no protected trees and therefore from an arboricultural point of view, no objections are raised. The details of replacement landscaping may be conditioned in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance and level of landscaping.

From a drainage perspective, no comments have been received from the Council's Drainage Officer, however a standard drainage condition can be imposed to ensure satisfactory drainage of the site.

Summary

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the proposal is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents and would not impact harmfully on the character of the area. To highway safety implications would result from the proposal and the development would not impact on trees. It is therefore recommended that Members grant planning permission.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref(s): 05/02468/FULL1, 06/00093/FULL1 and 17/002290, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. (i) Details relating to the
 - (a) appearance
 - (b) landscaping
 - (c) scale

shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced.

- (ii) **Application for approval of the details referred to in paragraph (i) above must be made not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this decision notice.**
- (iii) **The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of two years from the final approval of the details referred to in paragraph (i) above, or in the case of approval on different dates, the final approval of the last such matter to be approved.**

Reason: No such details have been submitted and to comply with the requirements of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. **Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied boundary enclosures of a height and type to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be erected in such positions along the**

boundaries of the site(s) as shall be approved and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of visual amenity and the amenities of adjacent properties.

3. No development shall take place until details of drainage works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and drainage works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to first use of any dwelling. Prior to the submission of those details, an assessment shall be carried out into the potential for disposing of surface water by means of a sustainable drainage system in accordance with the principles of sustainable drainage systems set out in Annex F of PPS25, and the results of the assessment provided to the Local Planning Authority. Where a sustainable drainage system scheme (SuDS) is to be implemented, the submitted details shall:

i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and / or surface waters;

ii) specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SuDS scheme, together with a timetable for that implementation; and

iii) provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development, which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.

The scheme shall be implemented, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan and in order to ensure the satisfactory drainage of the site.

4. Before any work is commenced details of parking spaces and/or garages and sufficient turning space shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such provision shall be completed before the commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted and shall thereafter be kept available for such use. No development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not, shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

5. **The floor(s) of the garage(s) shall be constructed at such level(s) that the gradient of the access drive(s) does not exceed 1:10 at any point, as calculated from the levels of the back edge of the footway to the front of the garage floors.**

Reason: In order to comply with Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

6. **Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include measures of how construction traffic can access the site safely and how potential traffic conflicts can be minimised; the route construction traffic shall follow for arriving at and leaving the site and the hours of operation, but shall not be limited to these. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T5, T6, T7, T15, T16 & T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

7. **Surface water from private land shall not discharge on to the highway. Details of the drainage system for surface water drainage to prevent the discharge of surface water from private land on to the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the drainage system shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained permanently thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan and in order to ensure the satisfactory drainage of the site.

8. **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.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

9. **Details of the proposed slab levels of the building(s) and the existing site levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before work commences and the development shall be completed strictly in accordance with the approved levels.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

10. **No loose materials shall be used for surfacing of the parking and turning area hereby permitted.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of highway safety.

- 11. The development hereby permitted shall be built in accordance with the criteria set out in Building Regulations M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and shall be permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: To comply with Policy 3.8 of the London Plan 2015 and the Mayors Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance 2016 and to ensure that the development provides a high standard of accommodation in the interests of the amenities of future occupants.

- 12. Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window(s) in the first and second floor flank elevations shall be obscure glazed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 13. No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the flank elevation(s) of the development hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 14. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided at the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T7 and Appendix II.7 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

- 15. Details of arrangements for storage of refuse and recyclable materials (including means of enclosure for the area concerned where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved arrangements shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate refuse storage facilities in a location which is acceptable from the residential and visual amenity aspects.

- 16. A minimum distance of 6m shall be provided between the front doors of the garage(s) and the back edge of the footway.**

Reason: In order to comply with Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

You are further informed that:

- 1 The applicant is advised that any works associated with the implementation of this permission (including the demolition of any existing buildings or structures) will constitute commencement of development. Further, all pre commencement conditions attached to this permission must be discharged, by way of a written approval in the form of an application to the Planning Authority, before any such works of demolition take place.**

- 2 You are advised that this application may be liable for the payment of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the Planning Act 2008. The London Borough of Bromley is the Collecting Authority for the Mayor and this Levy is payable on the commencement of development (defined in Part 2, para 7 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). It is the responsibility of the owner and /or person(s) who have a material interest in the relevant land to pay the Levy (defined under Part 2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)).**

If you fail to follow the payment procedure, the collecting authority may impose surcharges on this liability, take enforcement action, serve a stop notice to prohibit further development on the site and/or take action to recover the debt.

Further information about Community Infrastructure Levy can be found on attached information note and the Bromley website www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL

- 3 Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.**

- 4 The applicant is advised that discharging surface water run-off to public sewer without attenuation is not acceptable.**

- 5 You should contact extension 4621 (020 8313 4621 direct line) at the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre with regard to the laying out of the crossover(s) and/or reinstatement of the existing crossover(s) as footway. A fee is payable for the estimate for the work which is refundable when the crossover (or other work) is carried out. A form to apply for an estimate for the work can be obtained by telephoning the Highways Customer Services Desk on the above number.**

- 6 Before works commence, the Applicant is advised to contact the Pollution Team of Environmental Health & Trading Standards regarding compliance with the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and/or the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Applicant should also ensure**

compliance with the Control of Pollution and Noise from Demolition and Construction Sites Code of Practice 2008 which is available on the Bromley web site.

If during the works on site any suspected contamination is encountered, Environmental Health should be contacted immediately. The contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Authority for approval in writing.

This page is left intentionally blank

Section '3' – Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT

Application No : 17/02538/FULL6

Ward:
Chislehurst

Address : 41 Heathfield Chislehurst BR7 6AF

OS Grid Ref: E: 544247 N: 170605

Applicant : Ms T Glass

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey rear extension. Infill porch extension with flat roof canopy above and insertion of door to side elevation with glass canopy above

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Chislehurst
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 16

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension at the rear corner of the house that will replace the existing conservatory. The extension will have a length of 5.5m, projecting to the rear of the house by 3.0m and will have a width of 4.9m. The roof will be flat with a height of 2.9m, excluding the canopy that will add a further 0.8m to the height of the structure. The extension will be sited between 1.6m and 1.75m from the flank boundary of the site, taking account of the angled side boundary of the site.

To the front of the house an infill is proposed to the existing enclosed porch to bring the front wall flush with the front of the house. A flat wooden canopy will be provided above the porch that will extend out from the front of the house by 0.6m.

To the western side elevation, a door is proposed to be inserted with a flat glazed canopy above. The glazed canopy will project 0.5m from the flank wall.

This application has been "called-in" by a local Councillor.

Location

The application site is a detached two storey house sited in an area characterised by other similar dwellings site in spacious plots. The site and surrounding area falls within the Chislehurst Conservation Area.

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations received are summarised as follows:

- Loss of light and overshadowing

- Harmful visual impact and impact on neighbouring amenities
- Discrepancies in the measurements on the drawing including distances to boundaries

Consultations

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas (APCA) did not inspect the application.

Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

The NPPF confirms that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Chapter 7 - Requiring Good Design

Chapter 12 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

The London Plan (2015)

Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management

Policy 7.4 Local Character

Policy 7.6 Architecture

Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets

Unitary Development Plan (2006)

BE1 Design of New Development

BE11 Conservation Areas

H8 Residential Extensions

Other Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 – General Design Principles

Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 – Residential Design Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance – The Chislehurst Conservation Area

Emerging Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and the final consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). The updated Local Development Scheme was submitted to Development Control Committee on November 24th 2016 and Executive Committee on November 30th 2016, and indicated the submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State in mid-2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 6 – Residential Extensions

Draft Policy 37 - General Design of Development

Draft Policy 41 – Conservation Areas

Planning History

Planning permission was granted under ref. 08/02663 for alterations to roof of single storey rear extension to provide lantern light.

Planning permission was granted under ref. 00/03178 for a two storey side and single storey rear extension and rear dormers.

Conclusion

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 occupants of surrounding residential properties.

Impact on the Character of the Conservation Area

Policy BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan requires new development to enhance and preserve the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. New development will be expected to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces; and respect and incorporate in the design existing landscape or other features that contribute to the character, appearance or historic value of the area. This policy is consistent with Draft Policy 41 of the Draft Local Plan.

Policies H8 and BE1 and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance seek to ensure that new development, including residential extensions are of a high quality design that respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development. These policies are consistent with Draft Policies 6 and 37 of the Draft Local Plan.

Policy 7.4 of the London Plan seeks that buildings should provide a high quality design that has regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets in orientation, scale, proportion and mass and contributes positively to the character of the area. Consistent with this, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that new development should reflect the identity of local surroundings and add to the overall quality of the area.

The proposed rear extension will be in context with the scale and design of the host building without competing with the character of the house or the wider area. The development will be sited away from publicly viewable areas of the Conservation Area and will not therefore be conspicuous. To the front of the house, the proposed porch infill will be modest in scale and the roof design will complement the host building, subject to matching elevational materials.

The two proposed canopies above the new side door and front porch will have a low height and a very low projection out from the surface of the side and front elevations respectively.

The proposals are therefore considered to comply with Policies BE1, BE11 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policies 6, 37 and 41 of the emerging Local Plan and the guidance in the Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Chislehurst Conservation Area.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Policy BE1 also seeks to ensure that new development proposals, including residential extensions respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and that their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by loss of outlook or overshadowing. This policy is consistent with the Draft Policy 37 of the Draft Local Plan.

The main potential impact of the rear extension will be on the amenities of No. 43 to the west, as the separation to No. 39 would be considerable. The design of the extension provides a low flat roof of 3.0m in height with a roof lantern set away from the boundary. The proposed extension will project to the rear of No. 43 by approximately 3.0m and will be separated by approximately 2.4m. Due to the south-facing orientation of the houses the proposed rear extension is, on balance, not considered to result in a significant degree of impact on No. 43 either by way of loss of light or visual impact. The proposed flank door and canopy will not offer views into No. 43, which has no facing flank windows.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 37 of the emerging Local Plan.

Summary

Having had regard to the above it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents and would not impact detrimentally on the character of the Conservation Area. It is therefore recommended that Members grant planning permission.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref(s): 08/02663/FULL6 and 17/02538/FULL6, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

CONDITIONS

- 1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.**

Reason: 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.

- 3. 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.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

This page is left intentionally blank

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 16/05756/FULL6

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 47 Hayes Wood Avenue Hayes Bromley
BR2 7BG

OS Grid Ref: E: 540634 N: 166155

Applicant : Kate Crossley

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Roof alterations to incorporate hip to gable extension, side and rear dormers and first floor rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

Update to Report

Members will recall that the application was previously reported to Plan Sub-Committee No.1 at the meeting held on the 13th April 2017. The application was deferred without prejudice pending the outcome of the enforcement investigation or to report back to Members within six months of the date of this meeting on the pending investigations whichever was sooner.

The application proposes roof alterations to incorporate hip to gable extension, side and rear dormers and first floor rear extension. The proposed roof alterations would result in a similar development to those which already exist at a number of properties within the street, including No.15, No.35 and No.67. These developments have been constructed without planning permission.

No alterations have been made to this application following deferral on the 13th April, however Members will note that a retrospective application for No.67 (ref: 17/01724/FULL6) was refused permission at Plans Sub-Committee 3 on the 6th July 2017 on the following grounds;

1. The proposed roof alterations are unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and detrimental to the visual appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses, resulting in an incongruous and unsatisfactory

addition to the streetscene, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Enforcement action was also authorised in respect of the development at No.67 Hayes Wood Avenue.

An application for retrospective permission at No.35 is to also be considered at this committee.

The report as previous is set about below and suitably amended.

Description

Permission is sought for roof alterations to incorporate hip to gable extension, side and rear dormers and a first floor rear extension.

The property features a front gable with a hipped roof element to the side. It is proposed to alter to hipped element to provide a side gable. The proposed gable would provide a continuation of the ridge height of the existing hipped element for a width of 3.2m. The roof alterations also includes a dormer in the front/side roofslope with a width of 2.9m and depth of 4.3m, and a rear dormer with a width of 5.41m and a depth of 4.5m.

The proposed first floor rear extension would have a depth of 1.851m and a width of 2.604m to square off the property at first floor level. It is noted that permission has been granted previously for this element under application ref: 16/05758/FULL6.

Location

The application site hosts a two storey semi-detached property located on the western side of Hayes Wood Avenue. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it Listed.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

Planning Considerations

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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012):

The NPPF confirms that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

London Plan (2016):

7.4 Local Character

7.6 Architecture

Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development

H8 Residential Extensions

H9 Side Space

Draft Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the draft Local Plan will be to the Secretary of State in mid 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions

Draft Policy 8 Side Space

Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

Planning History

The site has previously been the subject of the following applications;

- 90/00308/FUL - First floor rear extension - Permitted 11.04.1990
- 16/05758/FULL6 - First floor rear extension - Permitted 13.02.2017
- 16/05757/PLUD - Loft conversion to incorporate hip to gable extension, rear and side dormers and front rooflight - Refused 13.02.2017

The site is also currently the subject of a further application which is currently pending consideration;

- 17/00675/FULL6 - Roof alterations to incorporate front/side dormer. (To be considered on the same Committee).

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

It is noted that there are examples of similar developments within the street such as at No.15, No.35 and No.67. No permission has been granted for these developments by The Council. A retrospective application at No.35 is currently under consideration, whilst a retrospective application at No.67 was refused

permission at Plans Sub-Committee on the 6th July. No recent applications have been received by The Council for the other properties.

Furthermore, the application site was the subject of an application for a Lawful Development Certificate (ref:16/05757/PLUD) for a similar proposal, which was refused on the grounds that the proposal does not constitute permitted development under Class B (c) of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as it would result in part of the dwellinghouse extending beyond the plane of the roofslope that forms the principle elevation of the building and fronts a highway.

Accordingly the Council must consider this application on its own merits and in light of the current policies.

Design

London Plan Policy 7.4 requires developments to have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area. Policy BE1 states that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout. Policy H8 states that the design and layout of proposals for the alteration or enlargement of residential properties will be required to (i) the scale, form and materials of construction should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area and (ii) space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.

The application seeks permission for alterations to the roof of the property consisting of a hip to gable extension, and side and rear dormers. There is a general uniformity in the design of the semi-detached properties within the immediate streetscene, including front gables and a hipped roof element to the side.

The property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses; both of which currently benefit from front gables and a hipped roof element to the side. Para 4.4 of policy H8 states that "the enlargement of a roof structure from a hipped design to a gable end is unlikely to be acceptable except in relation to end of terrace dwellings".

The proposed hip to gable extension and side dormer would significantly alter the character of the host dwelling and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached buildings. These additions would be considered to result in a bulky and obtrusive form of development which is considered out of character with the area.

The proposed rear dormer is large and would contribute to the bulk of the proposal, though it would be screened by the proposed hip to gable extension. However, given the size of the rear dormer, and the concerns raised regarding the hip to gable extension and side dormer, it is considered that the scale and bulk of the roof alterations would harm the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the area.

The proposal also includes a first floor rear extension, though it should be noted that this has previously been granted permission under ref: 16/05758/FULL6 and no alterations are proposed to this element within this application. As such, the design and appearance of the rear extension is considered acceptable.

Side Space

Policy H9 normally requires proposals of two or more storeys in height to provide a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building. The proposed first floor rear extension would be adjacent to the boundary, however it would be sited to the rear of the property and not visible from the street. Given the above, and that it would not project beyond the rear of the neighbouring, the extension would not result in a cramped appearance or unrelated terracing and would therefore not be contrary to Policy H9.

Residential Amenity

Policy BE1 (v) states that the development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring building and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. This is supported within Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

The first floor rear extension would not be visible from either of the adjoining neighbours given that it does not project beyond the existing rear walls of the host dwelling or the neighbouring property at No.45. Furthermore, the proposed rear dormer is not considered to result in any significant harm to the amenities of the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light or outlook. Any additional overlooking resulting from the rear window of the first floor extension or the rear dormer would not be considered significantly above that which already exists from the existing first floor rear windows, and therefore any impact in terms of loss of privacy would not be significant.

The proposed hip to gable and front/side dormer elements would increase the bulk of the property, however not to the extent that would result in significant harm in terms of the loss of light or outlook to neighbouring properties. The flank wall of the gable would be blank, whilst the front/side dormer would only feature one window serving an en-suite. If permission were forthcoming it would be recommended for a condition to be added to ensure the flank window proposed would be obscure glazed, and that no further windows can be added to the flank window in order to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

Summary

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would not respect the character of the host dwelling, and would result in an unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, harmful to the visual amenities of the area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 16/05756/FULL6 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed roof alterations are unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and detrimental to the visual appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses, resulting in an incongruous and unsatisfactory addition to the streetscene, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.**

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 17/00675/FULL6

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 47 Hayes Wood Avenue Hayes Bromley
BR2 7BG

OS Grid Ref: E: 540634 N: 166155

Applicant : Kate Crossley

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Roof alterations to incorporate front/side dormer

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

Update to Report

Members will recall that the application was previously reported to Plan Sub-Committee No.1 at the meeting held on the 13th April 2017. The application was deferred without prejudice pending the outcome of the enforcement investigation or to report back to Members within six months of the date of this meeting on the pending investigations whichever was sooner.

The application proposes roof alterations to incorporate hip to gable extension and front/side dormer. The proposed roof alterations would result in a similar development to those which already exist at a number of properties within the street, including No.15, No.35 and No.67. These developments have been constructed without planning permission.

No alterations have been made to this application following deferral on the 13th April, however Members will note that a retrospective application for No.67 (ref: 17/01724/FULL6) was refused permission at Plans Sub-Committee 3 on the 6th July 2017 on the following grounds;

1. The proposed roof alterations are unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and detrimental to the visual appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses, resulting in an incongruous and unsatisfactory addition to the streetscene, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Enforcement action was also authorised in respect of the development at No.67 Hayes Wood Avenue.

An application for retrospective permission at No.35 is to also be considered at this committee.

The report as previous is set about below and suitably amended.

Description

Permission is sought for roof alterations to incorporate hip to gable extension, side and rear dormers.

The property features a front gable with a hipped roof element to the side. It is proposed to alter to hipped element to provide a side gable that would provide a continuation of the ridge height of the existing hipped element for a width of 3.2m. The roof alterations also include a dormer in the front/side roofslope with a width of 2.9m and depth of 4.3m, and a rear dormer with a width of 5.41m and a depth of 2.8m.

Location

The application site hosts a two storey semi-detached property located on the western side of Hayes Wood Avenue. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it Listed.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and the following representations were received;

- The proposed loft conversion is similar to that shown on application 16/05757 that was deemed unlawful.
- Projection results in an awkward looking hump on the side elevation.
- Resulting shape introduces a significant foreign element, visually detrimental to the elevations of the house and the street scene.

Planning Considerations

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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012):

The NPPF confirms that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

London Plan (2016):

7.4 Local Character
7.6 Architecture

Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions

Draft Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the draft Local Plan will be to the Secretary of State in mid 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions
Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

Planning History

The site has previously been the subject of the following applications;

- 90/00308/FUL - First floor rear extension - Permitted 11.04.1990
- 16/05758/FULL6 - First floor rear extension - Permitted 13.02.2017
- 16/05757/PLUD - Loft conversion to incorporate hip to gable extension, rear and side dormers and front rooflight - Refused 13.02.2017

The site is also currently the subject of a further application which is currently pending consideration;

- 16/05767/FULL6 - Roof alterations to incorporate hip to gable extension, side and rear dormers and first floor rear extension. (To be considered on the same Committee).

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

It is noted that there are examples of similar developments within the street such as at No.15, No.35 and No.67. A retrospective application at No.35 is currently under consideration, whilst a retrospective application at No.67 was refused permission at Plans Sub-Committee on the 6th July. No recent applications have been received by The Council for the other properties.

Furthermore, the application site was the subject of an application for a Lawful Development Certificate (ref:16/05757/PLUD) for a similar proposal, which was refused on the grounds that the proposal does not constitute permitted development under Class B (c) of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as it would result in part of the dwellinghouse extending beyond the plane of the roofslope that forms the principle elevation of the building and fronts a highway.

Accordingly the Council must consider this application on its own merits and in light of the current policies.

Design

London Plan Policy 7.4 requires developments to have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area. Policy BE1 states that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout. Policy H8 states that the design and layout of proposals for the alteration or enlargement of residential properties will be required to (i) the scale, form and materials of construction should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area and (ii) space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.

The application seeks permission for alterations to the roof of the property consisting of a hip to gable extension, and side and rear dormers. There is a general uniformity in the design of the semi-detached properties within the immediate streetscene, including front gables and a hipped roof element to the side.

The property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses; both of which currently benefit from front gables and a hipped roof element to the side. Para 4.4 of policy H8 states that "the enlargement of a roof structure from a hipped design to a gable end is unlikely to be acceptable except in relation to end of terrace dwellings". The proposed hip to gable extension and side dormer would significantly alter the character of the host dwelling and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached buildings.

It is noted that the pitch of the roof to the gable extension would be much steeper when viewed from the front in comparison to that which is proposed under application ref: 16/05756. This application would increase the steepness of the existing front roofslope by bringing the ridge height of this element 1.2m further towards the front of the property, which would result in further additional bulk to the front of the property.

The proposed rear dormer would contribute to the bulk of the proposal, though it would be screened by the proposed hip to gable extension. The rear dormer proposed in this application is reduced in its depth from that of the other current application (ref: 16/05767). No concerns are raised in respect of the dormer itself, however it would contribute to the additional bulk to the host dwelling.

Given the scale, bulk and design of the roof alterations it is therefore considered that the proposal would harm the appearance of the host dwelling. It would result in an obtrusive form of development, out of character with the area and streetscene in general.

Residential Amenity

Policy BE1 (v) states that the development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring building and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. This is supported within Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

The proposed roof alterations would add significant bulk to the property, however are not considered to result in any significant harm in terms of the loss of light or outlook to neighbouring properties. The flank wall of the gable would be blank, whilst the front/side dormer would only feature one window serving an en-suite. If permission were forthcoming it would be recommended for a condition to be added to ensure the flank window proposed would be obscure glazed, and that no further windows can be added to the flank window in order to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

Any additional overlooking resulting from the rear dormer would not be considered significantly above that which already exists from the existing first floor rear windows, and therefore any impact in terms of loss of privacy would not be significant.

Summary

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would not respect the character of the host dwelling, and would result in an unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, harmful to the visual amenities of the area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 16/05756/FULL6 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed roof alterations are unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and detrimental to the visual appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses, resulting in an incongruous and unsatisfactory addition to the streetscene, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.**

This page is left intentionally blank

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 17/01568/ADV

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : 162 High Street Beckenham BR3 1EW

OS Grid Ref: E: 537276 N: 169472

Applicant : Mr Saverjeet Gurwara

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

The installation of one illuminated fascia and projecting sign.

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Beckenham Town Centre
Areas of Archeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Primary Shopping Frontage
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

The application seeks advertisement consent for the installation of one fascia sign; with halo illuminated applied lettering and one internally illuminated projecting sign. The application also includes an awning with the business name.

The plans have been revised since submission with amendments to the design of fascia. This includes removal of the internally illuminated box and the use of applied lettering with halo illumination together with a reduction in the overall height of the fascia by around 200mm.

There is an associated application for the shopfront under reference: DC/17/01723, which is also considered on this agenda. The application has been called in by a ward Councillor.

Location

The application relates to a three-storey, plus roof accommodation an end of terrace property, which forms part of a wider commercial parade. The site includes commercial units at ground floor and what appears to be residential accommodation above. The site forms part of the Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- Appreciate that the bright orange and white colour scheme is part of the company's brand, but it is garish and in no way compliments the character of the high street.
- We would support the disallowing of internally illuminated fascia signs on the High Street, in favour of painted signs that are externally illuminated.
- At 1.4m in high, the size of the internally illuminated fascia is excessive.
- Rather than being flush with the building façade, the fascia signage projects out by 100mm.
- Comment was received in relation to the shopfront, however this is being considered under a separate application detailed below.

Highways - Illuminated signs visible from the highway must comply with the latest issue of the Institute of Lighting Engineers Technical Report No 5 Brightness of illuminated advertisements.

None of the signs replacing the existing signs appear to interfere with any visibility splays so I would have no objection to the proposal. However the projecting sign appears to overhang the highway so please include informative DI03

Environment Health - No objections

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas, (APCA) were consulted on the application and their comments can be summarised as follows: Objection. The fascia is too deep and includes a poor and unsympathetic design. Contrary to Policy BE19.

Planning Considerations

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

BE11 Conservation Areas
BE21 Control of Advertisements and Signs
T18 Road Safety

Draft Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State will be in mid-2017.

Relevant policies:

Policy 37 General Design of Development
Policy 41 Conservation Areas
Policy 102 Advertisements.

Planning History

87/00333/ADVILL -Advertisement Consent granted on the 12.03.1987 for the installation of an internally illuminated fascia and projecting Box Sign.

17/01723/FULL - A planning application for the installation of a replacement shopfront, awning and roller shutter is currently being considered by the Council.

Conclusions

The main issue in this case is whether the proposed sign(s) would be significantly harmful to the appearance of the host building and the character of the Beckenham Town Centre Conservation area within which the property lies.

In respect of pedestrian and highway safety no objections have been received from the Council's Highways Officer. This is considered to be acceptable.

Policy BE21 states that advertisements should have regard to the character of the surrounding area and be in keeping with the scale, form and character of any building on which they are placed. They should also preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The application property is prominent within the streetscene but forms part of a larger commercial parade. The host building is of traditional red brick construction, with timber sliding sash windows.

It is noted there are a variety of different advertisements within the high street, including large fasciae with evidence of both internal and external illumination. There is also evidence of a number of externally and internally illuminated projecting signs within the high street. However, many of these examples were installed prior to the Conservation Area Designation in 2015.

A core principle of the NPPF is to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations. Indeed the NPPF seeks to promote positive planning, which can shape and direct development. In this case the newly designated Conservation Area will now provide greater control going forward thereby enhancing the character and appearance of the area over time.

The applicant has amended the proposal since submission. The proposal originally included an entirely internally illuminated fascia. However, the amendments now propose the use of applied lettering with halo illumination. There has also been a marginal reduction in the height of the fascia by around 200mm. The amendments to the fascia lettering and use of halo illumination are more sympathetic to the traditional character of the building and wider CA in general, but the overall size of the fascia is considered overly large in scale and, together with the level of

information/detail shown on the fascia, internally illuminated projection sign and bright awning, would result in a highly prominent over-proliferation of advertisements. The proposal would detract from the traditional character of the building and wider terrace, which fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to Policy BE21 of the UDP.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 17/01568/ADV and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information

as amended by documents received on 18.07.2017
RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1. The proposed advertisements, by reason of their scale, design and number, would result in a prominent over-proliferation of advertisements which fails to respect the scale, character and appearance of the host building, and wider Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area contrary to Policy BE21 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).**

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 17/01723/FULL1

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : 162 High Street Beckenham BR3 1EW

OS Grid Ref: E: 537276 N: 169472

Applicant : Mr Saverjeet Gurwara

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Installation of new shop front with metal shutter and retractable awning.

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Beckenham Town Centre
Areas of Archeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Primary Shopping Frontage
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

The application seeks consent for the installation of a new shop front, with retractable awning and grill shutter.

The works to the shopfront have already been carried out, however at the time of the site visit the awning was not in place.

The plans have been revised since submission with amendments to the design of the shopfront in order to accurately reflect what has been built out. This includes one central door showing a step into the unit, lower stall riser and amendments to the shutter, which now incorporates an open grill design.

There is an associated application for advertisements under ref: 17/01568, which is also considered on this agenda. This application has been called in by a ward Councillor.

Location

The application relates to a three-storey, plus roof accommodation an end of terrace property, which forms part of a wider commercial parade. The site includes commercial units at ground floor and what appears to be residential accommodation above. The site forms part of the Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area.

Consultation

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- No particular objection to modern full-height glass frontages but the stallriser is so short that it is practically redundant. There should be stall riser of a traditional height or none at all.
- The roller shutter is off pressed steel which is unwelcoming and susceptible to graffiti. Wish to see lattice or 'brick-bond' type shutters, through which the shop front window is visible.
- Don't want to see the High Street turned into a series of 'chocolate box' shop frontages, there must be satisfactory relationship between the ground and upper floors. In this case there is very little.
- Appreciate that the bright orange and white colour scheme is part of the company's brand, but it is garish and in no way compliments the character of the high street.
- Comments were also made with regard to the signage, however this relates to a separate application for advertisement consent currently being considered by the Council.

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas, (APCA) were consulted on the application and their comments can be summarised as follows: No objections, but the door step does not comply with accessible access.

Planning Considerations

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

London Plan

7.2 Inclusive Access

7.4 Local Character

7.6 Architecture

7.8 Heritage Assets and archaeology

Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development

BE11 Conservation Areas

BE19 Shopfronts

BE20 Security Shutters

Draft Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State will be in mid-2017.

Relevant policies:

Policy 37 General Design of Development

Policy 41 Conservation Areas

Policy 101 Shopfronts and Shutters

All other material considerations shall also be taken into account.

Planning History

87/00333/ADVILL -Advertisement Consent granted on the 12.03.1987 for the installation of an internally illuminated fascia and projecting Box Sign.

17/01568/ADV - An application for advertisement consent is currently being considered by the Council for the installation of an illuminated fascia and projecting sign.

Conclusions

The main issue in this case is to judge the level of harm that the proposed shopfront would cause to the appearance of the host building and streetscene and whether or not it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area within which the property lies. Consideration should also be given to accessibility and any highways issues.

No objections have been raised by the highways officer with regarding to vehicular or pedestrian safety.

Policy BE19 states that when considering applications for shopfronts the Council will require the proposed to be well related to its context (ii) be of a high quality design (iii) period features should be retained where appropriate; (iv) deep or uninterrupted fascia's are avoided; (v) stall risers are provided; (vi) display windows at first floor level are avoided; and (vii) appropriate provision is made for access by those with mobility impairment.

Paragraph 6.51 of the above policy states that the design of shop fronts has a critical role to play in the creation of attractive and vibrant town centres. They are frequently replaced and altered as tenants change. As the character and appearance of a shopping parade or street is determined by its individual components, it is important that any proposals are viewed in respect of the wider environment as well as the individual unit. It goes on to state that good design can make a positive contribution to urban character. It is vital that designs and materials of shopfronts are sympathetic to the scale and existing features of the host building and its surroundings. In particular the standardisation of shop design is often at odds with the traditional scale of the buildings. The original character and individual qualities of buildings in shopping centres should be preserved. In conservation areas and historic buildings it is particularly important that materials relate to the period, style and character of the buildings.

BE11 states that in order to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas, a proposal for new development, alteration or extension to a building will be expected to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings.

The site is located within the Beckenham Town Centre Conservation Area. The works to the shop front have already been carried out. The existing shop front included a side door with one display window, which was broken up by a single transom creating two glazed panels. A fanlight was situated above the door. The overall design and proportions of the existing shopfront were more in keeping with the traditional character of the host building. It is noted that High Street Beckenham encompasses a variety of shop fronts, with traditional and modern designs. These vary in terms of their materiality, glazing pattern and stall riser depth. Examples of these modern shop fronts with large areas of uninterrupted glazing, and low stallriser, include No 108-110 High Street Beckenham. However, many of these examples were installed prior to the Conservation Area designation in 2015.

A core principle of the NPPF is to "conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations". Indeed the NPPF seeks to promote positive planning, which can shape and direct development. In this case the newly designated Conservation Area will now provide greater control going forward thereby enhancing the character and appearance of the area over time.

In this case, the large areas of uninterrupted glazing without the structural base of a stallriser or the visual break created by a mullion and transoms; together with the brush colouring of the shop frame, shutter box and awning has resulted in an unsympathetic and prominent form of development which fails to comply with Policy BE19. In turn, it fails to respect or complement the character, appearance, proportions and rhythm of the existing building and streetscene in general and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA, being contrary to Chapters 7 & 12 of the NPPF; Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies BE1, BE11 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

Furthermore, the new shop front includes a central step which has removed the level access required for DDA compliance. It does not therefore include appropriate access for those with mobility impairment contrary to Policy 7.2 of the London Plan, BE19 of the UDP (2006).

The proposal would also include a roller shutter. This would only cover the glazed area and the open grill design is considered to be appropriate and more sympathetic to the traditional character of the building.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 17/01723/FULL1 and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information

as amended by documents received on 18.07.2017
RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The design of the replacement shopfront does not provide accessible access and fails to respect or complement the character, appearance, proportions and rhythm of the existing building and would not therefore preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, being contrary to Chapters 7 & 12 of the NPPF; Policies 7.2, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) and Policies BE1, BE11 and BE19 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

This page is left intentionally blank

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 17/02580/FULL6

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 35 Hayes Wood Avenue Hayes Bromley
BR2 7BG

OS Grid Ref: E: 540626 N: 166111

Applicant : Mr David Cordell

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Roof alterations to incorporate side/rear dormer and rooflights
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 51
Urban Open Space

Proposal

Retrospective permission is sought for roof alterations to incorporate a hip to gable extension, and side / rear dormers.

The property features a front gable with a hipped roof element to the side. It is proposed to alter the hipped element to provide a side gable that would increase the steepness of the existing front roofslope by increasing the ridge height of this element by approx. 0.8m and bringing it 2.2m further towards the front of the property. A front/side dormer is included with a width of 3.2m and depth of 2.8m that would match the ridge height of the hip to gable extension. The roof alterations would also result in the ridge height extending further to the rear with a steeply pitched roof.

Location

The application site hosts a two storey semi-detached property located on the western side of Hayes Wood Avenue. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it Listed.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

Planning Considerations

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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

The NPPF confirms that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

London Plan (2016)

7.4 Local Character

7.6 Architecture

Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development

H8 Residential Extensions

Draft Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that the submission of the draft Local Plan will be to the Secretary of State in mid 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions

Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

Planning History

The application site has no previous planning history.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

It is noted that there are examples of similar developments within the street such as at No.15 and No.67. No permission has been granted for these developments by The Council. A retrospective application for No.67 was refused permission at Plans Sub-Committee on the 6th July. No recent applications have been received by The Council for the other properties which have already constructed similar developments.

It should be further noted that two applications for similar developments at 47 Hayes Wood Avenue are also under consideration at this Committee (ref: 16/05756/FULL6 and 17/00675/FULL6).

Furthermore, the application site at No.47 was the subject of an application for a Lawful Development Certificate (ref:16/05757/PLUD) for a similar proposal, which was refused on the grounds that the proposal does not constitute permitted development under Class B (c) of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as it would result in part of the dwellinghouse extending beyond the plane of the roofslope that forms the principle elevation of the building and fronts a highway.

Accordingly the Council must consider this application on its own merits and in light of the current policies.

Design

London Plan Policy 7.4 requires developments to have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area. Policy BE1 states that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout. Policy H8 states that the design and layout of proposals for the alteration or enlargement of residential properties will be required to (i) the scale, form and materials of construction should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area and (ii) space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.

The application seeks permission for alterations to the roof of the property consisting of a hip to gable extension, and side/rear dormer. There is a general uniformity in the design of the semi-detached properties within the immediate streetscene, including front gables and a hipped roof element to the side.

This application would increase the steepness of the existing front roofslope by increasing the ridge height of this element by approx. 0.8m and bringing it 2.2m further towards the front of the property, which would result in further additional bulk to the front of the property.

The roof alterations would also result in the ridge height extending further to the rear with a steeply pitched roof which would contribute to the bulk of the proposal, though this element would not be highly visible from the street.

The property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses; both of which currently benefit from front gables and a hipped roof element to the side. Para 4.4 of policy H8 states that "the enlargement of a roof structure from a hipped design to a gable end is unlikely to be acceptable except in relation to end of terrace dwellings". The proposed hip to gable extension and side dormer would significantly alter the character of the host dwelling and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached buildings.

Given the scale, bulk and design of the roof alterations it is therefore considered that the proposal would harm the appearance of the host dwelling. It would result in an obtrusive form of development, out of character with the area and streetscene in general.

Residential Amenity

Policy BE1 (v) states that the development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring building and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. This is supported within Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

The proposed roof alterations would add significant bulk to the property, however are not considered to result in any significant harm in terms of the loss of light or outlook to neighbouring properties. The flank wall of the gable would be blank, whilst the front/side dormer would only feature one window serving an en-suite. If permission were forthcoming it would be recommended for a condition to be added to ensure the flank window proposed would be obscure glazed, and that no further windows can be added to the flank window in order to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

Any additional overlooking resulting from the rear window would not be considered significantly above that which already exists from the existing first floor rear windows, and would also be lessened given this window would be inset from the rear projection of the roof. Therefore any impact in terms of loss of privacy would not be significant.

Summary

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would not respect the character of the host dwelling, and would result in an unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, harmful to the visual amenities of the area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 17/02580/FULL6 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed roof alterations are unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and detrimental to the visual appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses, resulting in an incongruous and unsatisfactory addition to the streetscene, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.**