

**Section '3' - Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT**

**Application No : 15/01177/FULL6**

**Ward:**

**Bromley Town**

**Address : 23 Stone Road Bromley BR2 9AX**

**OS Grid Ref: E: 539910 N: 167933**

**Applicant : Mr Dale Woodcock**

**Objections : YES**

**Description of Development:**

Two storey side and single storey rear extensions

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Smoke Control SCA 51

**Proposal**

The application is for the construction of a part one/part two storey rear extension and single storey side extension.

The part two-storey rear extension would be staggered with a maximum depth of 5.8m; this would then be set back to a depth of 2.6m. It would incorporate a four pitched roofs. The single-storey rear extension would also be staggered but would have a depth of 4.7m. It would include a part pitch/part flat roof with a maximum height of 3.2m and an eaves height of 2.5m.

The application also proposed a single storey side extension that would have a width of 2.95m and a depth of 10.9m. It would incorporate a part pitch/part flat roof with a maximum height of 3.2m and an eaves height of 2.5m. It would be set back from the front elevation by 2.2m.

Location

The application relates to a large detached two-storey residential dwelling, which is located on the south east side of Stone Road. The surrounding is residential in character with large detached houses of varying architectural styles.

## **Consultations**

### Comments from Local Residents

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

- o Outlook and perspective adversely affected
- o The extensions are enormous and is totally out of keeping with the other houses within the street
- o Spoil vista and would jut out into the garden
- o The increase in floor area appears to be over 70% of the current build
- o The scale of the extension is overly large in the context of neighbouring properties
- o It would set a precedent
- o The increase in the percentage floor space is the equivalent of a second house rather than an extension.
- o The house has already been extended so the increase is even larger when compared to the original size of the house.
- o Concerns that the room would be used for meetings. The house is already used for large meetings.
- o The meetings and parties outlined above causes significant parking disruption this will be exacerbated

### Comments from Consultees

No statutory consultees

## **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

SPG 1 - General Design Principles  
SPG 2 - Residential Design Guidance

### Planning History

14/03951/FULL6  
Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension Refused 08.12.2014

Refused for the following reason:

1. The depth, height, overall scale and bulky design of the proposed extension is such that it represents a disproportionate addition to the dwelling, which fails to respect the character of the dwelling. In addition, the significantly increased depth would be evident from the street, and when viewed within the context of the streetscene, the resultant dwelling would appear overly large and bulky, therefore giving the dwelling undue prominence and adversely impacting upon the character of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Council's Supplementary Guidance 1 and 2.

Appeal Dismissed (APP/G5180/D/15/3005557) on the 5th May 2015. The inspector found that the

"due to its height, depth and bulk, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore fails to comply with Policies BE1 and H8 of the London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (2006)"

## **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. Consideration should also be given to the previous reason for refusal.

### **Design**

The existing dwelling comprises of a large detached two storey dwelling with a hipped roof and two front gable projections. The proposed extension would result in 2 two storey rear projections, with a single storey flat roof rear projection to the rear and north eastern side. The neighbouring property to the south west has a large two-storey rear projection close to the common boundary with the application site.

The primary bulk of the extensions would be contained to the rear of the property but would be partially be visible from the street scene due to spaces between the buildings. It would however be highly visible from neighbouring properties. The two-storey rear extension would have a staggered appearance with a maximum depth of 5.8m at the south west end of the property and 2.6m at the north west side. The application has been revised since the previous refusal with a reduction in the depth of the two-storey rear extension from 8.9m to 5.8m at its maximum point. Alterations have also been made to the roof of the two-storey addition, which now includes a number of pitched roofs in order to reduce the overall height and mass of the scheme.

The single-storey rear extension has also been reduced by 2m at the north west side of the development to a depth of 4.6m. The extension would have a part flat/part pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.2m and an eaves height of 2.5m.

The property benefits from a large and open rear garden, which a depth of 35m. Given the above, officers consider that the reduction in the depth of the extension and change to the design of the roof would lessen the bulk of the scheme to an acceptable degree and would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Members may therefore consider that on balance, the reduction in depth of the extensions and change in the design of the roof have overcome the previous reasons for refusal and that the character and appearance of the host property and area would not be significantly harmed.

The proposed side extension would serve as a garage and would be set back from the front elevation by 2.2m. The overall proportions of this extension are considered to be in keeping with the application property and given the setback would not result in significant harm to the appearance of the host dwelling or streetscene.

#### Neighbouring amenity

In relation to neighbouring amenity No. 21 Stone Road does not have any windows in the flank elevation facing the application dwelling. The proposed single storey extension would extend 4.7m beyond the rear elevation of No. 21 Stone Road and has been reduced since the previous refusal. It would include a set back from the common boundary by 1m and would have a maximum height of 3.2m and an eaves height of 2.5m, which would pitch away from this boundary. Whilst officers acknowledge that the extension is large, the overall depth and height of the proposal are not considered to be significantly intrusive or overbearing, given the depth and open nature of the rear garden and set back from the boundary. The two storey projection closest to this neighbouring property is modest in depth and would include a roof which would again pitch away from the common boundary. This would lessen the visual bulk of the scheme for neighbouring occupiers and would not appear overly prominent when viewed from No. 21. Whilst officers acknowledge there may some overshadowing during the afternoon hours officers consider this would not be significant enough to warrant a refusal. Given the above, Members may therefore consider that the extensions would have an acceptable impact on the visual amenities of No 21 Stone Road.

With regard to the other neighbouring property at No. 25 Stone Road, this dwelling has three ground floor and two first floor windows facing the application site. The proposed extension would not project beyond the rear of this neighbouring property, at two storey level and would be further separated from the boundary by approximately 3.9 metres. When taking this relationship into account, it is considered that the extension would not appear overbearing when viewed from this dwelling and given the orientation of the property and set back no significant loss of light is anticipated. In addition, subject to a condition restricting the insertion of windows in the flank elevations of the extension, it is considered that the extension would not adversely affect the amenities of either neighbouring dwelling.

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 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

**REASON: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

- 2 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.**

**REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.**

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.**

- 4 No windows or doors shall at any time be inserted in the side elevation(s) of the extensions hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.**

**In the interests of the amenities of nearby residential properties and to accord with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan**