

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

Application No : 14/00368/FULL1

Ward:
Farnborough And Crofton

Address : 81 High Street Farnborough Orpington
BR6 7BB

OS Grid Ref: E: 544154 N: 164314

Applicant : Mr Philip Brouard

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing building and erection of part two/three storey building with office on part ground floor and 3 bedroom residential unit to rear of ground floor, first and second floors and extension/alteration to single storey building at rear to provide home studio.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Local Distributor Roads
Open Space Deficiency

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following:

- demolition of existing building
- erection of part two/three storey building (maximum height of approx. 8.1m)
- building would have a metal roof, wooden cladding on first floor and render on ground floor
- office on part ground floor (38m²)
- 3 bedroom residential unit to rear of ground floor, first and second floors
- extension/alteration to existing single storey building at rear to provide home studio (roof raised by 0.6m and extended approx. 6.3m forward into the site)

Location

This proposal is to replace the existing detached building at the site. The existing building is currently used as offices, at present by an architectural firm. The building is sited on the northern side of the High Street. The site is adjacent to the Farnborough Village Conservation Area. Opposite the site are playing fields which form part of the Green Belt.

Consultations

Nearby neighbours were notified of the proposal but at the time of writing the report no responses were received. Any letters received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Comments from Consultees

Highways - No objections raised in principle.

Environmental Health- No objections raised.

Thames Water/ Drainage- No objections raised in principle subject to suggested conditions and informatives.

Planning Considerations

In considering the application the main policies are H1, H7, H9, BE1, BE13, T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan. These concern the housing supply and design of new housing/new development, development adjacent to a conservation area and the provision of adequate car parking and road safety.

Members will note that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which was adopted in March 2012 is also relevant in this case.

Planning History

The planning history of the site is summarised as follows:

- 13/00474 - Advertisement consent was granted for an internally illuminated fascia sign to front elevation
- 04/00722- Planning permission granted for a single storey rear extension
- 93/01934 - Planning permission granted for a shopfront
- 86/03542- Planning permission granted for a change of use from dental surgery to offices
- 84/02617- Planning permission granted for the change of use from offices to dental surgery

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are whether this type of development is acceptable in principle in this location, the likely impact of the proposed scheme on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, having particular regard to layout and design of the proposed scheme.

The proposed building would replace an existing single storey building with accommodation in the roofspace. The proposed building would have a three storey

appearance when viewed from the street frontage with a lower two storey height at the rear. The mansard style roof would provide the third storey. As indicated on the submitted streetscene plan, the proposed building would be of a similar ridge height to the adjoining properties. However, given the mansard style roof Members may consider that the proposal would be overdominant compared with the surrounding development.

The building is to be constructed up to the boundary with the area of open land to the west. Approximately 1.3m separation will be retained to the eastern boundary (with No.83). This area is shown to be red-hatched on the drawing at being in the freehold ownership of No.83. It is considered that adequate separation would be retained between the two buildings. It is noted that there is an area of open land to the west of the site, no side space is provided to the western boundary which would be in breach of the 1m side space requirement of Policy H9. Members may consider that the proposed building would appear cramped in this context.

In terms of the proposed design and materials, the building would be contemporary in appearance with the use of contrasting materials on different storeys. The roof is proposed to be constructed of metal, the first floor to be clad in wood and the ground floor to be white rendered. Concerns have been raised from the Conservation Officer regarding the design of the mansard roof and front balconies stating that their bulk would lead to the building being overdominant in the streetscene and detrimental to the character of the area. There is a mix of styles and designs of properties in the surrounding area and given that the site is located adjacent to the Farnborough Village Conservation Area Members will need to take a view as to whether the proposed design is appropriate in this context.

It is noted that the office unit would have its main access to the side of the site which does not form part of the site outlined in red by the Applicant. This access appears to be the right of way for No.81. The proposed office unit would occupy 38m² of the ground floor space. A condition could be imposed to restrict this use to an office as currently operated at the site.

The proposed residential unit would occupy the remainder of the building, with the living and kitchen area set to the rear of the ground floor, with the 3 bedrooms on the upper floors. There are four windows proposed on the upper levels of the western flank to serve the bedrooms which would overlook the adjoining open space. The flank windows to the eastern flank mainly serve bathrooms and will be obscure glazed. Members may consider that given the siting of the windows the development is unlikely to result in a loss of privacy to adjoining residents. The resulting rear garden would measure approximately 11m in depth and Members will need to assess whether they consider that this is sufficient to serve the proposed residential unit.

The proposal also includes the extension and alteration of an existing outbuilding, to provide a home studio. The building would be extended into the site by approximately 6.3m and would involve raising the roof by 0.6m in height. The resulting outbuilding is large in size and results in a significant development in the rear garden. If Members were minded to recommend permission, a condition may

be imposed restricting the use of the outbuilding to the residents of the residential property only.

Whilst the main element of the proposal, comprising of the residential accommodation and office, is significantly larger than the existing building, as the location of the building is offset from the adjoining maisonettes (nos.77/79) the impact of this element of the proposal on No.s 77/99 is reduced and considered to fall within acceptable levels. In respect of the main element of the proposal, any additional impacts on the residential amenities of No.83 will result from the first floor element of the proposal and the increase in the height and bulk of the building. A substantial amount of development is also proposed in the rear garden to provide a home studio, and when viewed a whole the proposal is considered to represent an over development of the site, that would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining properties.

With regards to the highways implications of the scheme, the access and parking for 2 cars will remain unchanged. Although there would be a shortfall of one car parking space for the new residential and office unit, it is considered that, given the amount of on-street car parking available, this would not be sufficient to warrant to refusal of planning permission on this basis alone.

In summary, it is considered that the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site, and that as a result of the design of the scheme the proposal will also be detrimental to the streetscene and out of keeping with the surrounding area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 14/00368 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposal, by reason of its scale/bulk and the quantum of additional development proposed in the rear garden would result in the overdevelopment of the site that will be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the surrounding residential properties, thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
The design of the building with its bulky mansard roof is considered to be detrimental to the streetscene and out of keeping with the surrounding area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.