

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 14/00926/FULL6

Ward:
Kelsey And Eden Park

Address : 5 Hillcrest Close Beckenham BR3 3HB

OS Grid Ref: E: 536609 N: 167502

Applicant : Mrs A Gorman

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer, front roof lights, two storey side and single storey rear extensions

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency

Proposal

The proposal is for a two storey side extension with a side projection of 3.5m and a depth of 8.7m. This would provide additional living accommodation and a utility room downstairs, along with two additional bedrooms and bathroom upstairs. To the rear, a 3.0m deep single storey extension is also proposed. A loft conversion and construction of a rear dormer is also proposed to provide a further bedroom and shower room in the loftspace.

This application follows the refusal of consent for a similar proposal under ref. 13/04249/FULL6.

Location

The application property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses at the end of Hillcrest Close, Beckenham which is a cul-de-sac containing eight houses.

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received. Many of the objections reiterated previous objections which can be summarised as follows:

- no significant changes following the previous refusal

- negative impact on the character and appearance of the close
- increased pressure on parking in the street
- concerns about disruption during construction
- the extension are too large for the plot
- the rear dormer would allow overlooking at neighbouring properties
- the side extension would affect the symmetry of the houses in the street
- would result in inadequate amenity space
- negative impact on daylight to the rear of No.6 Hillcrest Close
- the Juliet balcony would allow overlooking
- the extended house will be visually overbearing
- overlooking at No.6 Elmdene Close

Comments from Consultees

Technical Highways comments were received which raised no objection, subject to conditions.

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
- H9 Side Space

The Councils adopted SPG design guidance is also a consideration.

Planning History

Under ref. 13/04249, an application for roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer, front roof lights, two storey side and single storey rear extensions was refused for the following reason:

"The proposed extensions, by reason of their overall size and bulk would constitute an over dominant addition to the main dwelling which would be out of character in this locality and would give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking and loss of privacy to surrounding properties, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance"

The current application makes some amendments to the proposal in an attempt to overcome this refusal.

Members will note that a separate application for a two storey side extension at the site is also being considered on the same agenda under ref. 14/00929.

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.

The host property sits within a limited plot at the end of the cul-de-sac, with an already close relationship to those properties in Elmdene Close to the west. The proposal is for extensive side and rear extensions, including new accommodation in the roofspace.

Regard must be had as to the extent to which the revised proposal overcomes the concerns of the Council.

The new proposal makes the following amendments to the proposal:

- The overall height of the roof has been set 0.2m lower than the main roof
- The width of the two storey side extension has been reduced from 4.0m to 3.5m
- The side extension has been set back from the front elevation by 0.5m
- The depth of the single storey rear extension has been reduced from 3.5m to 3.0m
- The eaves height of the rear extension has been reduced from 3.0m to 2.9m
- The overall height of the rear extension has been reduced from 3.9m to 3.75m
- The proposed rear dormer extension will have a window rather than a Juliet balcony
- The new windows in the rear of the two storey side extension (and that of the existing first floor bathroom) will be obscure glazed.

With regard to the side extension and roof alterations, it is considered that the reduction in width and overall height of the extensions will result in a more subservient addition to the main house, in line with adopted policy and guidance contained within the Council's SPG documents. It is noted that no first floor windows are proposed for the flank elevation of the side extension, and the extension would represent a less dominant feature in the streetscene over that previously proposed.

The provision of such a two storey feature as proposed is therefore considered to be an acceptable addition. Policy H8 states that the Council will expect the design of residential extensions to blend with the style of the main building. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance No.2 (Residential Design Guidance) also states in para 2.2 that side extensions should be designed in order to remain subservient to the main building, and extensions should respect the form of the host property without overwhelming the original design. On balance, Members may feel that the reduction in the scale of the side extension is in line with adopted policy and guidance.

The rear extension has been reduced in depth to 3.5m deep. Whilst this would encroach into the already somewhat limited garden space on site, the impact of the rear extension on the amenities of the adjoining property (No.6) is mitigated somewhat by the existence of a rear extension at No.6.

With regard to the rear dormer extension, the existing relationship with neighbouring properties is noted. The proposed dormer is not considered to give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking at surrounding properties (particularly Nos. 5 and 6 Elmdene Close to the west and No. 6 Hillcrest Close to the north) over and above that which might reasonably be expected in suburban residential environment. The removal of the Juliet balcony is also noted.

The application site was visited by the case officer and the aims and objectives of the above policies, national and regional planning guidance, all other material planning considerations including any objections, other representations and relevant planning history on the site were taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

On balance, having had regard to the above, Members may consider that the reduction in size and alterations to the scale and design of the proposed extensions are such that they would not result in an overdevelopment of the site, or give rise to a significant loss of amenity to local residents.

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

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------|--|-------|------------|
| 1 | ACA01 | Commencement of development within 3 yrs | | |
| | ACA01R | A01 Reason 3 years | | |
| 2 | ACC04 | Matching materials | | |
| | ACC04R | Reason C04 | | |
| 3 | ACK01 | Compliance with submitted plan | | |
| | ACK05R | K05 reason | | |
| 4 | ACI13 | No windows (2 inserts) | flank | extensions |
| | ACI13R | I13 reason (1 insert) | BE1 | |

