

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 12/01308/FULL6

Ward:
Shortlands

Address : 18 Whitecroft Way Beckenham BR3 3AG

OS Grid Ref: E: 538532 N: 168370

Applicant : Mr And Mrs Langdon

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of detached garage and erection of part one/two storey side and rear extension

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Park Langley

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area

London City Airport Safeguarding

London City Airport Safeguarding Birds

Proposal

It is proposed to demolish a detached garage and erect a part one / two storey side and rear extension. The proposal would comprise a two storey element projecting 4.8m to the rear and extending across just under half the width of the rear elevation (4.25m). It would be sited closest to the boundary with No.16. The two storey extension would be set back approx. 2.2m from the ground floor garage element and approx.3.8m from the most forward projecting front wall. A distance of 1.7m would be maintained to the boundary with No.16. The existing eave height would be maintained however the roof ridge level would be some approx.1m lower than the main roof ridge.

Location

The site is located within Park Langley Conservation Area which is characterised by:

"Many of the individual houses make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Harmonious diversity of design was a stated aim of the developers. As a result, there are very many different types and styles of houses in the estate.

Much of the character of the area is derived from a spacious layout, typical of the Garden City movement. Streets are broad and often curving: the

original designers strove to maintain at least 100 feet between the frontages of houses facing each other across the street. Mature trees remain from prior to the development of the estate. Many of the houses have extensive gardens with generous side space separating them from their neighbours."

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/ occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received including Park Langley Residents Association which can be summarised as follows:

- the property has limited space to the left which is complemented by the single storey garage to the right. The proposed development would upset this balance and create a property which will occupy an excessive frontage for the site
- proposal is an overdevelopment inconsistent with policies set out in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP-) and Supplementary Planning Guidance
- the planning committee should carefully consider if such a development is reasonable in a conservation area. The proposed building may seriously impact on other neighbouring properties
- the rear element of the proposal at 4.8m in depth will dominate the site
- upper rear window is very near to the boundary of my property at No.16 and would overlook leading to loss of privacy
- proposal would dominate the side access to my property giving an oppressive feel to a space that is currently light and airy
- proposal will dominate the host building and significantly alter the spatial standards of this road

Comments from Consultees

From a Heritage and Urban Design point of view as the proposed extension would leave a side space of 1.7m and the ridge height is subservient no objection is raised subject to matching materials.

Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas (APCA) - They comment that the proposal is an overdevelopment, poor design, loss of side space, contrary to Policy BE1, BE11.

Planning History

Under planning ref. 10/01108, planning permission was refused for a two storey side extension and single storey front and rear extension. The application was refused for the following reason:

"By reason of its scale, bulk and proximity to the boundary the part one/two storey side/rear extension would result in a cramped form of development, incongruous in appearance in relation to the existing house and seriously harmful to the visual and spatial characteristics of the Park Langley Conservation Area thereby contrary to Policies BE1, BE9, H8, H9

of the Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Park Langley Conservation Area."

A subsequent application submitted under planning ref. 11/00034 was withdrawn following concern regarding the scale of extensions for which permission was sought.

A further application followed under planning ref. 11/01733 which sought only to regularise the retrospective elements of the proposal. This application was granted permission.

Planning Considerations

In considering the application the main policies are H8, BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance contained within the Park Langley Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Policy H8 concerns residential extensions and requires the design and layout of proposals to complement the scale and form of the host dwelling, respect spaces and gaps between buildings which contribute to the character of an area.

Policy BE1 requires a high standard of design in new development generally, and seeks to protect the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Policy BE11 concerns conservation areas, extensions to properties within such an area will be expected to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces. This is also reflected in SPG for the area which states:

"The spacious layout of the estate does provide scope for the addition of sensitively designed extensions. However, a new extension should not dominate the existing host building or significantly alter the spatial characteristics of the road by taking up large amounts of side or front space. For this reason, the rear elevation will be the preferred location for extensions, but this does not preclude the possibility of alterations elsewhere.

New extensions should normally match the materials and finish of the host building. It will usually be appropriate to mark the new development by making it subservient in scale to the host: for example, by reducing the height of the roof ridge and marking the original exterior wall of the host building with a short return. Where houses employ details such as decorative lintels, stringcourses or window surrounds, every effort should be made to preserve the pattern and continuity of these during repairs and alterations."

Conclusions

At present there is a significant side space of around 6m separating the application property from the boundary with No.16. This gap is somewhat larger than is typical in the vicinity and therefore the principal of extending the property appears to be acceptable.

However, the main issue then is whether scale of extension is considered to be excessive and also whether or not it would preserve or enhance the character of Park Langley Conservation Area. The 1.7m side space is a reduction by just over two-thirds, however this needs to be considered alongside the factors which make this extension subservient to the main dwelling including the positioning of the first floor which is set back considerably (approx. 3.5m from the frontage, the ridge height has been lowered from that of the main roof and finally the design which complements the design of the host dwelling.

The extension projects approx. 4.8m to the rear and discernable impact would be restricted to the property at No.16. The occupants of this property have objected to the proposal on the basis that the side access to the house would become oppressive in a space that is currently light and airy. The rear upper window is also of concern to occupants of this property who consider its positioning would give rise to overlooking and loss of privacy. The proposal would reduce the amount of light to the side of the house and change the amount of spaciousness between buildings but it is considered having taken these comments into account that it would not impact so significantly on residential amenities to warrant a refusal of this application on this basis. With regard to the loss of privacy from the upper window, given the level of separation that would remain this (approx. 5m between first floor flank walls) any visibility as opposed to overlooking would be mutual and not of a direct nature.

It is clear that there will be an impact on adjacent properties as a result of this proposal and a judgement needs to be made about the whether the impact is unduly harmful. Accordingly, Members will need to take account of the plans that have been submitted for this site and the comments made by residents during the consultation period.

On the basis of the above the proposal is on balance considered acceptable.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 10/01108, 11/00034 and 12/01308, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|
| 1 | ACA01
ACA01R | Commencement of development within 3 yrs
A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2 | ACC04
ACC04R | Matching materials
Reason C04 |
| 3 | ACI17 | No additional windows (2 inserts) flank extension |

4 ACI17R I17 reason (1 insert) BE1
AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)

H8 Residential Extensions
BE1 Design of New Development
BE11 Conservation Areas

Application:12/01308/FULL6

Address: 18 Whitecroft Way Beckenham BR3 3AG

Proposal: Demolition of detached garage and erection of part one/two storey side and rear extension

