

## **SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration**

**Application No :** 15/00792/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**West Wickham**

**Address :** 15 Copse Avenue West Wickham BR4  
9NL

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 537752 N: 165466

**Applicant :** Ms Debbie Hankin

**Objections :** YES

### **Description of Development:**

First floor side extension and roof alterations incorporating rear dormers and front rooflights to extend habitable accommodation

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
Flood Zone 2  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Open Space Deficiency  
Smoke Control SCA 51

### **Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a first floor side extension and roof alterations incorporating rear dormers and front rooflights to provide habitable accommodation.

Location

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property located on the eastern side of Copse Avenue, West Wickham. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of residential properties.

### **Consultations**

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

Comments from Consultees

No consultee responses were requested as part of the application.

## **Planning Considerations**

BE1 Design of New Development  
H8 Residential Extensions  
H9 Side Space

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 & 2

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

### **Planning History**

Under planning application reference: 14/04203 planning permission was refused to incorporate rear dormers and a first floor side extension. The reason for refusal read as follows:

"The proposed first floor side extension would result in the dwelling appearing uncharacteristically cramped within the plot and would result in visual coalescence with the neighbouring dwelling to the north. The proposal would, therefore adversely affect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider character of the area and is contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan".

Under planning application reference: 86/01699 planning permission was granted for a single storey side/rear extension.

## **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.

### **Previously refused scheme**

The previously scheme was very similar to the proposal now before members. The main difference being that the roof design has been altered from a gable end to a half hip design. The agent has also amended the drawings of the current scheme so the side space afford to the first floor side extension now measures 1m as opposed to 0.9m to comply with the Council's side space Policy.

### **First Floor side extension**

The design of the first floor is considered to be in keeping with the character of the existing building incorporating a half hipped roof to the front of the property. In terms of side space it is noted that the first floor extension leaves a 1m side space

but the existing garage (built in 1986) only allows for a 0.9m side space to the boundary.

A window is proposed to the flank elevation at first floor level. It is the only window to the proposed new bedroom and is marked as being obscure glazed. This is considered unacceptable for the occupant of the bedroom and does not provide sufficient daylight and sunlight and is therefore contrary to Policy BE1 which requires that relationships with existing buildings should allow for adequate daylight and sunlight to penetrate in and between buildings.

#### Loft conversion

The plans show that the existing and new roof space is to be utilised to provide an additional bedroom. Two dormer windows to the rear of the roof extension will match in proportion, design and materials to the existing property. Three new rooflights are proposed in the front elevation. Given the varied nature of the character of the street these are considered acceptable features in this instance.

#### Residential Amenity and Impact on Adjoining Properties

In terms of residential amenity it is considered that there would be no significant impact on the privacy and amenity of adjoining occupiers in terms of loss of light and outlook, siting and position of the enlarged mass of the extensions in this situation due to the reasonable separation distances to adjoining property and buildings.

#### Spatial standards

The agent has stated the garage was granted planning permission by the Council in 1986 when the Council's Policy for side space was 900mm. The existing garage will remain.

The side extension affords the required 1m side space under Policy H9 but not for the full flank elevation. It is considered that the spatial characteristics of the area and the buildings character would be maintained to ensure adequate separation and to safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents. As such the proposal does not represent a cramped appearance and does not result in unrelated terracing and therefore almost maintains the spatial standards and level of visual amenity of the streetscene in this case. Members will need to decide whether the existence of the garage at 0.9m is adequate separation to the boundary.

Policy H8 of the Unitary Development Plan states that proposals for alterations and enlargements should respect and complement the host dwelling and be compatible with the surrounding area.

The hip to half hip roof extension would result in a change to the roof form and would alter the balance of the host dwelling and that of the adjoining semi (at

No.17). The houses in the surrounding area are all semi-detached dwellings with mainly hipped roofs and the immediate area is characterised by this. The agent has provided photographs of half hipped roofs at No.'s 35, 37 and 66 Copse Avenue. As a result the proposed change in roof form from hip to half hip on balance may be considered acceptable but would result in a change to the visual amenity of the street scene.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 15/00792 & 14/04203 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED**

The reasons for refusal are:

**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, harmful to the character and appearance of the Area of Special Residential Character, and contrary to Policies H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.**

**The proposed obscure glazed first floor flank window lacks adequate natural light levels, being the only window to the bedroom, thereby contrary to Policy BE1 which seeks to provide for adequate daylight and sunlight to penetrate in and between buildings.**