

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 14/00698/FULL6

Ward:
Petts Wood And Knoll

Address : 27 West Way Petts Wood Orpington
BR5 1LN

OS Grid Ref: E: 544700 N: 167659

Applicant : Mr Cristian McDermott

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single Storey side extension incorporating a garage to the front of the property.

Key designations:

Area of Special Residential Character
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding

Proposal

The proposal comprises a ground floor garage to the front of the site that will be sited adjacent to the flank boundary. Behind this, the ground floor side extension will run the length of the dwelling, connecting the house to the existing outbuilding at the rear, with a rear extension of 0.85m to achieve the connection.

The roof will provide a false pitch to the front with a height of 3.2m and the flat roof behinds this will have a height of 2.6m. The attached building to the rear will have a pitched roof with a height of 3.9m.

Location

The property is located on the northern side of West Way. The site currently comprises a semi-detached two storey dwelling. The area is characterised by similar semi-detached houses set within relatively spacious plots. The area is characterised by generous side space between buildings and the area falls within the Petts Wood Area Of Special Residential Character.

Comments from Local Residents

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

- o Impact on the character and appearance of the Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) - precedent would be set for further similar side extensions that would impact on the character of the area

- o Spaces between dwellings would be reduced, altering the character of West Way and would be contrary to UDP policies that seek to preserve the gaps between buildings and prevent the erosion of the spaciousness of the area
- o Proposal would lead to future terracing effect on the road
- o Proposed garage is an inadequate width for use as a garage for cars.
- o Letters of support have been received stating that then proposal would not impact harmfully on the character of the area.

Comments from Consultees

None.

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

H10 Areas of Special Residential Character

The Council's adopted SPG guidance is also a consideration.

Planning History

Planning permission was refused under ref. 11/03348 for a part one/two storey side and rear extension. The refusal grounds were as follows:

'The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirement for a minimum 1 metre side space to be maintained to the flank boundary in respect of two storey development in the absence of which the extension would constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene and the Area of Special Residential Character, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed and contrary to Policies H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed extension, by reason of its excessive bulk and scale, would result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character, contrary to Policies BE1 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.'

The proposal was subsequently dismissed on appeal. The Inspector states:

'No 27 is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling within Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character, as defined by the adopted Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP). West Way contains other detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying styles. I saw when I visited the site that those on the opposite side of the

road to the appeal side are designed in a slightly different manner and are positioned closer together than most of the dwellings on this side of West Way. On this side of the road the semi-detached dwellings, similar to No 27, have double driveway widths between them. This uniform rhythm of development and the space between the dwellings is an important part of the character and appearance of the streetscene here.

The proposed garage would be built close to the side boundary and although the first floor side extension would be set off the boundary it would still be close, at 1.5m. While, it would accord with UDP policy H9 in so far as it seeks to ensure that 2 storey extensions are positioned a minimum of 1m from the side boundary of the site, the large extension would result in an erosion of the rhythm of development here and in particular the space between the dwellings. As such, it would conflict with UDP policy H10 which seeks to protect the established character and appearance of Areas of Special Residential Character, such as this.

I am aware that some other dwellings in the surrounding area have been extended in a similar manner. Nevertheless, I have dealt with this case on its own merits and on the basis of the character and appearance of the dwellings nearby and on the same side of the road, since this is the context that the proposal would be seen within.

Given the orientation of the dwelling and its relationship to other dwellings nearby I am not convinced that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on local living conditions. However, this lack of harm is greatly outweighed by my findings in relation to the main issue.'

Planning permission was refused under ref. 12/02038 for a part one/two storey front/side and rear extension. The refusal grounds were as follows:

'The proposed extension, by reason of its design and siting, would erode the space between the buildings and would result in a detrimental impact on the character, rhythm and spatial standards of the streetscene and this part of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character, contrary to Policies BE1, H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.'

This application was also subsequently dismissed on appeal, with the Inspector raising similar concerns.

Planning permission was refused under ref. 13/02272 for a single storey front/side and rear and first floor rear extension, roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer extension. The refusal grounds were as follows:

'The proposed extension, by reason of its design and siting, would erode the space between the buildings and would result in a detrimental impact on the character, rhythm and spatial standards of the streetscene and this part of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character, contrary to Policies BE1, H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.'

The application was subsequently part allowed and part dismissed at appeal. The Inspector rejected the ground floor side section of the proposal and stated:

'The proposal seeks, in part, to construct a single storey flat roof side extension incorporating a garage, which would project beyond the main front elevation of the house, to a point broadly in line with the protruding bay windows to the front of the property. The single storey height of the proposed side extension would maintain the gap between properties at first floor level. However its prominent forward projection would, when viewed from the street, emphasise the intrusion into the characteristic gap between dwellings, which would not have been the case had the front of the garage been aligned with the main façade, in the location of the existing wooden gates.

Moreover, the forward projection beyond the main building line to the side of the property would appear as an incongruous feature in its own right, projecting beyond the broadly uniform main facade where, characteristically, protrusions are limited to bay windows. As a result, I consider that the projecting garage would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the ASRC.

Since the garage is an integral part of the design of the ground floor extension, I am unable to sever it from the rest of the proposal so as to enable me to grant a split decision excluding the garage. Consequently, I must conclude that the whole of the proposed single storey side extension is contrary to Policies BE1 and H10 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan, which seek that development in ASRCs respect or complement the established and individual qualities of the individual areas and that development should not detract from the street scene.'

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

This side of West Way possesses no similar side extensions to that proposed, although some of the dwellings possess side car ports or open-sided structures. The opposite side of West Way comprises dwellings of a different character where side garages and two storey extensions are more common.

Following the Inspector's concerns, the proposed side extension has been redesigned so that it would not project in front of the building line. The Inspector found this projection to harm the character and appearance of the Area of Special Residential Character and dismissed this part of the appeal. The Inspector noted that there are no similar forward projecting garages or side extensions on this side of West Way.

The design and appearance of the single storey side extension closely matches that previously dismissed at appeal, with the extension set-back to be in line with the front of the dwelling. In paragraph 7 of the Inspector's report, the Inspector

considered whether it would be possible to sever the garage from the rest of the proposal to enable him to grant a split decision excluding the garage. Whilst the Inspector took the view that the garage was integral to the design of the overall ground floor extension, the text raises no objections that are of relevance to the revised proposal for the garage.

On the basis of the Inspector's previous concerns, it is considered that the alteration to the siting of the extension would satisfactorily address the Inspector's objection and the revised proposal would not be considered incongruous or have a significant impact on the character of the area.

Concerning the amenities of neighbouring properties, the Inspector found no issue in this regard. It is therefore considered that no additional harm could be caused as a result of the fact that the proposal has reduced the bulk by setting the garage back from the previously dismissed position. It is noted that the ground floor side window at No. 29 is obscurely glazed and serves a kitchen, however the relationship was considered acceptable on balance by the Inspector.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the Area of Special Residential Character and would not impact on neighbouring amenities. 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). 11/03348, 12/02038, 13/02272 and 14/00698 excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1ACA01 Commencement of development within 3 years
- ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
- 2ACC04 Matching materials
- ACC04R Reason C04
- 3ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan

In order to comply with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and the amenities of the nearby residential properties.