

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 15/04542/FULL6

**Ward:
Shortlands**

Address : 67 Bushey Way Beckenham BR3 6TH

OS Grid Ref: E: 538903 N: 167712

Applicant : Mr Andy Grant

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Two storey side extension and loft extension to provide additional habitable accommodation

Key designations:

Area of Special Residential Character
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 9
Smoke Control SCA 21

Proposal

It is proposed to erect a part one/two storey side extension. The two storey element would lie in front of the existing single storey element, above which a first floor extension is proposed. The resultant side extension would be set back by approx. 1.5m from the front gable, excluding the bay window, and the full two storey height of the flank elevation would lie 1.5m from the boundary with Malmains Way.

The flank extension would incorporate a pitched roof. The ridgeline of the host dwelling would be set approx.. 0.35m lower than the main ridgeline of the host dwelling.

The application has been submitted following the refusal of planning permission under ref. 15/03305. The application differs from that which was refused in that:

- The extension ridgeline has been lowered.
- The formerly proposed gable with small hipped element has been replaced by a fully hipped roof to correspond with that of the host dwelling.

Location

The application site lies on the corner of Bushey Way and Malmains Way, within the Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character.

The host dwelling is detached and incorporates a single storey side/rear extension which is set 1.5m from the boundary with Malmains Way.

The host dwelling has a front gable feature and the total first floor separation to the flank boundary of the site is approx. 4.4m, with the hipped roof sloping away from the flank boundary. The front elevation of the single storey flank extension is set back approx. 4m from the front gable elevation (excluding the bay window).

Consultations

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

- o Proposal would be sympathetic to the main house
- o Would complement the surrounding area
- o No impact on neighbouring amenities

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the NPPF, Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan:

NPPF

Para. 56 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and indivisible from good planning. Para. 58 states that planning decisions should respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials

UDP

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side space
H10 ASRC

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 & 2
Appendix I of the UDP which relates to ASRC.

London Plan

Policy 7.4 Local Character

Planning History

Planning permission was refused under reference 15/03305 for a similar scheme to the current proposal. Permission was refused on the grounds:

1. The proposal does retain sufficient side space to the flank boundary of the prominent corner site and would therefore constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed and contrary to Policies H8, H9, H10 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2. The proposed extension would be incongruous, bulky and overdominant in appearance, which would be harmful to the appearance of the existing dwelling and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the distinctive character of the Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character, thereby contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The application seeks to overcome the previous reason for refusal and has been supported by a planning statement providing examples of other similar development within the ASRC.

The examples provided by the applicant of similar side space to the boundary within the ASRC are:

45 Bushey Way (flanking Woodmere Way)

Planning permission refused under reference 91/1211 for the erection of a first floor side extension on grounds relating to the prominent location of the development, on a corner plot, with the proposed development comprising a cramped form of development, detrimental to the spatial standards of the area. An additional ground for refusal related to the potential for overlooking of the adjacent properties.

Planning permission was subsequently permitted under reference 93/01975 for a first floor side extension which provided a side space of 1.2m from the first floor extension to the flank boundary at the front, increasing to 2.8m at the rear.

Planning permission was granted under reference 13/03728 for a single storey rear extension and roof alterations to the front and side ground floor existing extensions, which did not alter the relationship between the host dwelling and the corner boundary.

47 Bushey Way (flanking Woodmere Way)

Planning permission was granted under reference 14/02664 for first floor/single storey side/rear extensions to the property. The existing dwelling had a two storey element adjacent to the boundary with Woodmere Way and the proposed extensions were sited behind this existing element; therefore the permitted scheme did not bring development closer to the flank corner boundary.

30 Top Park (flanking Elwill Way)

Planning permission was granted in 1987 under reference 87/01758 for the erection of a two storey side extension to the dwelling.

24 Brabourne Rise (flanking Elwill Way)

Planning permission was granted under reference 04/04543 for the erection of a replacement one/two storey detached dwelling with the erection of an additional detached dwelling fronting Elwill Way. A minimum of 1.9m side space was shown to be retained between the replacement dwelling fronting Brabourne Rise and the boundary with Elwill Way, with a stepped flank elevation retaining a more generous side space between the front gable and the boundary.

57 Brabourne Rise (flanking Woodmere Way)

Planning permission was granted under reference 05/00635 for the erection of extensions to the host dwelling. These extensions did not impact on the relationship between the dwelling and the flank boundary with Woodmere Way.

59 Brabourne Rise (flanking Woodmere Way)

Planning permission was granted under reference 85/0905 for the erection of a two storey side extension to the host property.

Conclusions

The main issues in the determination of this application are the effect that it would have on the character of the Area of Special Residential Character, the visual amenities of the street scene and the impact of the proposals on the residential amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

In assessing the merits of the proposal it is necessary to consider whether the application overcomes the previous grounds for refusal, and whether the examples of corner development in the locality referred to by the applicant would support the current proposals in the context of the spatial standards and character of the ASRC.

Consistent character in the street scene of Bushey Way is generally achieved through a similarity in side separation, dwelling footprints and plot widths. The ASRC represents a coherent, continuous and easily identifiable area which has maintained its character and unity intact.

It is considered that in reducing the ridge height of the extension and deleting the obtrusive gabled roof previously proposed, the current proposal overcomes the ground of refusal relating to the appearance of the extension and its impact on the visual amenities of the area and the integrity of the host dwelling. While the extension is sizeable, it is subservient to the main dwelling, being set back from the main front elevation with a lowered ridgeline.

The proposal does not however increase the side space provided to the boundary, which remains at 1.5m as previously proposed and considered unacceptable in the context of the previous application. It is necessary to carefully consider whether the reduction in the bulk of the extensions, which sought to address the concerns of

the first ground of refusal, to some extent have the effect of mitigating the proximity of the first floor/two storey extensions to the corner boundary.

With regards to the examples of development in the locality which provides a similar retention of space to the corner boundaries, in the most part the planning history of the examples cited indicates that permission was granted prior to the adoption of the 1994 Unitary Development Plan which included a policy relating to development within Areas of Special Residential Character.

Where permission has been granted more recently, the extensions either maintained the existing relationship between the host dwelling and the corner boundary (in the case of Nos. 47 Bushey Way and 57 Brabourne Rise), or provided a minimum space to the corner boundary exceeding that proposed with this current application (including 24 Brabourne Rise - minimum of 1.9m side space and 45 Bushey Way - 1.2m increasing to 2.8m).

The previous examples cited by the applicant are not therefore considered individually to strongly support the current proposal's proximity to the boundary. Cumulatively, however, the number of similar examples of two storey development/first floor extensions retaining a broadly similar separation to the boundary may be considered to form a pattern of development on corner properties which the current proposal would complement. It is noted that the retention of 1.5m side space to the boundary would be at the lower limit of what may normally be acceptable in this ASRC, and may not complement the side space retained in the case of the opposite corner property at No. 65.

In conjunction with the generous width and openness of the corner and the street scene in this location, and with reference to the other developments in the locality, it is considered that on balance the proposal would not have so adverse an impact on the character and appearance of the ASRC as to justify the refusal of planning permission on these grounds alone. The proposal is considered to overcome the previous ground of refusal relating to the bulky and incongruous appearance of the proposed extensions.

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.