

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 12/02007/FULL6

Ward:
**Bromley Common And
Keston**

Address : 4 Cedar Crescent Bromley BR2 8PX

OS Grid Ref: E: 542224 N: 165224

Applicant : Mr John Simpson

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Side extension to include provision of habitable accommodation in roofspace; insertion of rooflights in front and rear elevation

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding

Proposal

This proposal is for a side extension to include the provision of habitable accommodation in roofspace. The property is proposed to be extended by 3.6m to the side which would be 8.56m in width with an overall height of 5.8m which would be level with the ridge line of the existing property. As previously mentioned habitable accommodation is proposed in the roofspace and as a result three rooflights are proposed to be inserted in both the front and rear elevations.

Location

The application site is located to the north of Cedar Crescent and is a detached bungalow with detached garage. Properties in the area are primarily detached bungalows of a similar scale and architectural style.

Comments from Local Residents

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

Comments from Consultees

No statutory consultations were undertaken as part of this application.

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 General Design Principles

Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 Residential Design Guidance

The London Plan and National Planning Policy Framework are also a key consideration in the determination of this application.

Planning History

There is no recent planning history pertaining to this property.

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.

A number of other properties in the area have previously constructed single storey side extensions, however, these generally do not include the provision of accommodation in the roofspace with the result that these extensions have a subservient appearance to the host dwelling. In this instance, however, the proposed extension would be of a significant height and would have a ridge line level with that of the original property. The proposal would provide a side space of 180mm and as such given the significant increase in bulk in close proximity to the flank boundary may be considered to result in a retrograde lowering of spatial standards within the area.

This extension would have a ridge height which would not be set below that of the host dwelling, as advocated by SPG2, and would project to the same position as the front gable feature rather than being level with the front door which further adds to its bulk and over-dominance. Therefore the proposed side extension with considerable height in close proximity to the flank boundary is not considered to respect or complement the host dwelling. As such the proposal may be considered to be detrimental to the established character of the area and visual amenities of the host dwelling.

The proposal would not project beyond the existing front or rear elevation of the host dwelling and would thereby largely be screened from the view of No. 5 by the existing property and as such the impact on the residential amenities of No. 5 are anticipated to be minimal. The adjoining property at No. 3 has previously constructed a single storey side/rear extension with a greater depth than that proposed and as such given the relationship between the application site and No. 3 and the orientation of the plot the proposal is not anticipated to result in significant detrimental impact on the residential amenities of No. 3.

On balance, having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is unacceptable in that its significant height in close proximity to the flank boundary would not respect or complement the host dwelling and would impact detrimentally on the spatial standards of the area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 12/02007, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed side extension would, by reason of its height and proximity to the flank boundary, not respect or complement the host dwelling and would impact detrimentally upon the visual and spatial amenities of the area, contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 and 2.

Application:12/02007/FULL6

Address: 4 Cedar Crescent Bromley BR2 8PX

Proposal: Side extension to include provision of habitable accommodation in roofspace; insertion of rooflights in front and rear elevation



"This plan is provided to identify the location of the site and should not be used to identify the extent of the application site"

© Crown copyright and database rights 2012. Ordnance Survey 100017661.