

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

Application No : 15/01547/FULL6

**Ward:
Bromley Common And
Keston**

Address : 81 Crown Lane Bromley BR2 9PJ

OS Grid Ref: E: 541985 N: 167545

Applicant : Mr Tim Baskett

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Two storey rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Local Distributor Roads
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 19

Proposal

- The proposal seeks permission for a two storey rear extension which would replace an existing two storey rear extension and conservatory.
- The ground floor extension would extend for the full width of the rear elevation of the original dwelling (6.1m wide) with a depth of rear projection of 5m and would extend to the eastern flank boundary of the site.
- At first floor level, the extension is inset from the eastern boundary by 2.1m and would have a width of 4m and a depth of 4.2m.
- The two storey extension would have a pitched roof which would measure 7.6m in height which would be lower than the ridge line of the roof of the original dwelling and would be hipped to match the original roof shape. The single storey part would have a glazed single pitch roof and at its highest point would measure 3.6m in height.

Location

The application site consists of a two storey detached dwelling on the north side of Crown Lane which is built up to the east side boundary. The area is characterised by predominantly detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings which have existing rear projections of a similar size to the proposal.

There is a detached garage on site to the rear of the property which is to remain in place and is situated 3.3m from the rear elevation of the existing house.

Consultations

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

- o The proposal would close off so much light from the neighbouring property
- o The outlook would be completely shut off
- o 12 years ago a similar plan was put forward and refused for these reasons
- o It would cause undue harm and overdominance
- o An obstruction of light
- o No. 81 has 6 of their 8 windows to the rear of the property, 4 facing the site
- o At ground floor, the height of the masonry wall significantly increases to 2.5m from 1.9m and is considered overbearing

Comments from Consultees

No comments received

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

SPG1 General Design Principles
SPG2 Residential Design Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework

Planning History

Planning permission was refused under ref. 01/01940 for a two storey side extension. The refusal grounds were as follows:

'The proposed roof treatment of the two storey side extension would be visually unrelated to the existing building and would be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene in general, thereby contrary to Policy H3 in the Unitary Development Plan and Policy H8 in the first deposit draft Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed extension would be seriously detrimental to the prospect and amenities enjoyed by the occupants of No. 77 Crown Lane, by reason of overshadowing, loss of light and visual impact, thereby contrary to Policy H.3 in the Unitary Development Plan and Policy H8 in the first deposit draft Unitary Development Plan.'

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area, the host dwelling and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

The existing house has a staggered rear elevation which appears to have been built at a similar time to the host dwelling. It is proposed that the existing rear two storey projection and conservatory would be demolished and replaced by a part two storey extension (4.2m in depth) and part single storey rear extension which would have a depth of 5m. The additional depth of rear projection would erode an additional portion of the rear amenity space and as there is a substantial garage situated in the rear garden, this impact must be carefully considered. However the rear garden has a substantial depth sufficient to serve the current and future occupiers of the dwelling; therefore, on balance it is considered that the proposal would not overdevelop the site or result in an inappropriate provision of amenity space for this size of dwelling.

The rear extension would not be clearly visible from the front of the property and therefore would not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area.

The two storey rear extension would have an overall depth of rear projection of 5m and a height of 7.6m. The 5m depth includes part of the demolished existing footprint, however the overall depth and height proposed, including the replaced existing extensions, is still considered significant. The adjoining neighbours at No. 77 and No. 85 have raised concerns regarding the loss of light and outlook to their properties. The proposed extension would be slightly less than 3m to the side boundary with No. 77 and it is proposed that the extension would have 4 windows to this side elevation, one existing window will be removed. No. 77 has a window in the ground floor flank elevation directly facing the proposed extension which serves kitchen for this property and is a primary window for this room. An amended plan was received which proposed to reduce the size of the first floor extension from 5m to 4.2m. On balance, Members may consider that the proposal would have some visual impact on the adjoining neighbours, however the proposed extension would increase the depth of the existing by around 1.4m at first floor level and therefore, the additional bulk would be minimal and would not result in a significant loss of amenity for the neighbouring dwellings to warrant a refusal of the application.

There is an existing garage at the rear of the property on the site which is large in terms of height. There is a window in the flank elevation of No. 77 which serves the kitchen (confirmed at the site visit) and is currently positioned in a manner where it currently benefits from receiving light through a separation between the rear elevation of the site and the garage. It is considered that the reduction in depth by 0.8m from the original drawings received on the 14th April 2015 is suitable to allow a sufficient level of light and reasonable outlook for this property as a separation of 2.5m would be retained at first floor level.

To the east, the extension would be stepped away by 2.1m at first floor level from this side boundary, however the single storey would extend up to the boundary and

would have a height of 3m. There is currently a rear conservatory which is constructed up to this side boundary, although the depth is only around 2.7m and it is proposed to extend this by a further 2.3m with an increase in height. The boundary at this point is well screened by a timber fence and tall vegetation, as a result the proposal would not significantly alter or additionally obscure the view from the ground windows of No. 85.

No. 85 has a staggered rear elevation with 6 windows to the side and rear elevation which look onto the site. It is considered that the depth of rear projection of the first floor extension of 4.2m and separation between the rear projections of the site and No. 85 by around 5m at first floor level, the proposed extension would have a degree of visual impact on this neighbour's outlook, however the extension would be viewed obliquely from the windows in inset rear elevation and there are primary windows towards the rear of the projection elevation of No. 85 which would not be affected by the proposal due to their orientation to the north. Members may therefore consider that No. 85 would retain a satisfactory outlook and prospect and that the proposal would not lead to any significant loss of light or a seriously harmful impact on this neighbour's residential amenities. Furthermore, the proposal would have a rear depth of projection which would be less than No. 85 by around 0.7m at ground level and 1.5m at first floor and there are a number of similar rear projections, in terms of depth, of two storeys in height in the surrounding area.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not have a harmful impact on the character of the area nor would it result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents. It is therefore recommended that Members grant planning permission.

As amended by documents received on 15th July 2015

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 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window(s) in the first floor western flank elevation shall be obscure glazed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE 1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 4 No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the first floor flank elevation(s) of the extension hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE 1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

- 5 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.