

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 11/02736/FULL6

Ward:
Cray Valley East

Address : Sunnybank Crockenhill Road Swanley
BR8 8EP

OS Grid Ref: E: 549435 N: 167157

Applicant : Mrs B Hearn

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Proposed veranda to front elevation
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION

Key designations:

Special Advertisement Control Area
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Green Belt
London City Airport Safeguarding
Local Distributor Roads

Proposal

This application seeks retrospective planning permission for an extension to the principal elevation comprising of a veranda. A previous retrospective application, ref. 11/00940, for the erection of two outbuildings forward of the principal elevation and an extension to the principal elevation comprising a veranda was refused by Members on 4th August 2011. This application seeks permission for the veranda included in the previous application, however the application has offered to accept a condition removing permitted development rights

The veranda is of an open timber construction with balustrades to the front and side with a pitched roof and runs the full width of the dwelling, some 12 metres. This structure projects 1.9 metres from the front elevation with a height of between 1.9 metres and 2.75 metres. The floor level is raised 0.5 metres from ground level with centrally positioned steps leading to the entrance.

Location

The application site is located to the southern edge of Crockenhill Road near to Crouch Farm and a short distance to the east of the site is the Borough boundary. The site features a detached two storey dwelling with a gated entrance and high

planting to the boundary with Crockenhill Road. The application site is within the Green Belt.

Comments from Local Residents

It is noted that one objection and one letter of support were received for the previous application ref. 11/00940 and these are contained within the respective file.

Comments from Consultees

None

Planning Considerations

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

- BE1 Design of New Development
- H8 Residential Extensions
- G1 The Green Belt
- G4 Dwellings in the Green Belt or on Metropolitan Open Land

Policy 7.16 of the London Plan
Planning Policy Guidance 2: Green Belts.

Planning History

Retrospective planning permission was refused under application reference 11/00940 on the grounds that:

The site is located in the Green Belt wherein there is a presumption against inappropriate development and the Council sees no very special circumstances which might justify the granting of planning permission for the proposed outbuildings, which are inappropriate by definition, as an exception to Policy G1 of the Unitary Development Plan or PPG2 'Green Belts'.

and

The proposed front extension, by reason of the additional floor area created, would result in an unacceptable enlargement over the original dwelling contrary to Policy G4 of the Unitary Development Plan and Central Government Guidance contained in PPG2 'Green Belts'.

Of particular relevance to this application and the requirements of Policy G4 is application ref. 83/00093 which granted permission for a two storey side and rear extension with dormer extensions and a porch.

Enforcement action is currently pending (ref.11/00112/OPDEV) for the development subject to application ref. 11/00940.

Conclusions

The main issues for consideration in this case will be the impact of the proposed front extension upon the character and openness of the Green Belt and the impact of the proposal to the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Aerial photos from 2006 show that the veranda had not been constructed with the aerial photos from 2010 showing the veranda to be in place. As such it is clear that the veranda has been erected within the last four years and is not part of the original dwelling.

Documents show the previous porch, which was replaced by the current veranda, was permitted in 1983 with the same forward projection, but a far smaller width and footprint, than the current structure. At the same time a two storey side and rear extension was undertaken, which involved the enlargement of the roof space for accommodation.

It is estimated from the original drawings contained with application reference 83/00093 that the extensions of 1983 represented an increase of some 57 square metres over the 102 square metres of the original dwelling, or 56% over the original floor area.

The applicant has argued that the current veranda does not exceed the area occupied by the former porch and two areas of hardstanding to either side. However, the porch was not part of the original dwelling and has since been removed, whilst the areas of hardstanding do not constitute a form of comparable development to that of the existing veranda. As such the veranda must be considered on its own merits as an extension to the principal elevation of the dwelling.

The applicant has further stated that they are willing to have permitted development rights removed from the property in order to prevent further unauthorised development. It is not considered that this suggestion constitutes very special circumstances that justify development within the Green Belt that is inappropriate by definition. It is considered that to accept this position as a very special circumstance would be to set a precedent that could be utilised throughout the Green Belt to justify inappropriate development.

It is considered that the proposal substantially exceeds the tolerances of policy G4, which have already been exceeded by the previous alterations carried out under application reference 83/00093. This states the net increase in floor area over that of the original dwelling may be no more than 10%. The veranda adds a further 22.8 square metres to the property, representing an increase of some 22% over the floor area of the original dwelling and a cumulative increase of 78% over the original floor area when previous additions are taken into account. As such it is considered that this extension is contrary to policy G4.

This application does not differ in substance from the previous refusal and only the applicant's statement of very special circumstances and proposed restriction of permitted development rights have been provided in order to overcome the second refusal ground of application ref. 11/00940. It is not considered that this overcomes the previous grounds for refusal.

It is therefore recommended that Members refuse the application on the grounds that the extension represents an unacceptable enlargement to the original dwelling in conjunction with previous extensions, contrary to Policy G4

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 11/00940, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed front extension, by reason of the additional floor area created, would result in an unacceptable enlargement over the original dwelling contrary to Policy G4 of the Unitary Development Plan and Central Government Guidance contained in PPG2 'Green Belts'.

FURTHER RECOMMENDATION:

The Enforcement Action currently pending be continued to secure the removal of the unauthorised extension.

Application:11/02736/FULL6

Address: Sunnybank Crockenhill Road Swanley BR8 8EP

Proposal: Proposed veranda to front elevation
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION

