

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

Application No : 15/00832/FULL6

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 74 West Common Road Hayes Bromley
BR2 7BY

OS Grid Ref: E: 540407 N: 165791

Applicant : Mr Steve Bainbridge

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Two storey rear extension and rooflights

Key designations:

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

Proposal

The subject site is a detached two storey dwelling. It is proposed to add a two storey rear extension and rooflights. The proposal has been amended following concern regarding the overbearing impact upon the neighbouring property no.72 and the overall design.

The proposal will therefore now involve the demolition of the existing conservatory and the replacement with a two storey rear extension that will project 3.8m in depth. The first floor will be set in 1m from the southern elevation. The roof will be hipped.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and 5 objections were received following the initial consultation which can be summarised as follows:

- Backland development has previously been granted for 74 West Common Road allowing a bungalow to be built in the garden. Further development will decrease the already small garden.
- Numerous windows overlooking the garden of 72 West common Road - proposed window at the rear of the property is out of keeping with the style of the house.

Following reconsultation of amended plans, one further letter has been received with the following comments:

- He revised plans are more considerate of the neighbour but the extension is still very large and out of keeping.
- Overlooking from the upper floor into private property and gardens.
- Three storey extension not a two storey
- - apex of the roof is large and will exceed privacy rights
- The property increases the size of the house without additional parking
- No notice displayed
- Grove Close is a private road and should not be used for deliveries or parking of construction vehicles

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

Relevant Planning History

05/03149/FULL6 Detached garage. Approved 7.10.2005

05/03410/FULL6 First floor side extension, side dormer and two rear dormers in the enlarged. Approved 26.01.2006

05/03412/FULL6 Single storey rear and two storey side extension. Approved 09.11.2005

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 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.

Neighbouring Amenity

Following a site visit to the neighbouring property No.76 to the south of the subject site, it was apparent that the two storey rear extension would be overbearing to No.76 in terms of its excessive height, depth and overall bulk in close proximity to the boundary. The proposal has therefore been subsequently amended. The first floor will now be set in 1m from the flank wall which will be a total of 2m from the common boundary with No.76. The roof will be hipped on both the southern and western elevation which reduces the overall bulk and mass of the extension.

The two windows at first floor level at No.76 (on the rear and side elevations of the original dwelling) which are set back from the main rear wall, both serve bathroom/toilets and the proposed extension is therefore not considered to cause harm in terms of loss of sunlight/daylight upon the amenities of No.76. Furthermore, the proposed windows to the side elevation will either be high level or obscured and the proposal will therefore not cause any privacy issues. Given the configuration of the dwellings and the fact that the extensions will be set in 2m from the common boundary with no. 76, the proposal is not considered to adversely impact upon the amenities of this property.

There have been a number of objections received from properties in Grove Close, to the rear of the site. In terms of overlooking to the properties to the rear, a third storey element has been removed from the proposal and the proposed roof will be hipped. There is some 60m from the existing rear building line and the rear building line to the properties in Grove Close, which is also separated by a private road. The proposal is therefore not considered to be detrimental to the properties in Grove Close in terms of overlooking.

In relation to concerns raised in relation to deliveries and construction, this is not a planning issue and therefore cannot be taken into consideration in the determination of this application. Given Grove Close is a private road, the Council does not have any control in relation to the parking of vehicles and this would be a private matter. However it is noted that the outbuilding located to the rear of the site would in any case prevent the use of the rear access for the storage or materials and construction vehicles.

In respect of the impact on surrounding properties, the proposal complies with Policy BE1 of the UDP and is therefore considered to be acceptable in this regard.

Design

The proposal will be located to the rear and will therefore not be readily seen from public viewpoints. The revised plans show a subservient extension which is considered acceptable in terms of appearance to the host dwelling and wider area. The proposal therefore complies with Policies H8 and BE1 of the UDP.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the host dwelling or surrounding area. On balance, it is recommended that permission be granted.

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 additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the side 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 BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.