## Section '3' - <u>Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or</u> <u>CONSENT</u>

Application No	o: 15/05205/FULL6	Ward: West Wickham
Address :	25 Braemar Gardens West Wickham BR4 0JN	
OS Grid Ref:	E: 538042 N: 166179	
Applicant :	Miss Katie Brown	<b>Objections : NO</b>

## **Description of Development:**

Roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer and front rooflights, first floor side extension, single storey front/side and single storey rear extensions

Key designations:

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

## Proposal

The application site lies on the western side of Braemar Gardens and comprises a semi-detached dwelling with an attached garage. The main host roof has a pitched roof with a front gable/catslide feature. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling has been the subject of a two storey side extension with the side extension under a pitched and hipped roof which is set lower than the main ridgeline.

It is proposed to erect a two storey extension in place of the existing garage. The extension would retain 1m side space at the front. The existing hipped roof would be provided with a gable end which would continue the ridgeline of the existing dwelling. The two storey side element would have a subservient ridgeline and a modest hipped roof.

At the front, a modest single storey extension would be provided with the cat slide roof continuing down to finish at the garage eaves. This element would incorporate front garage doors.

At the rear a single storey extension is proposed on the site of an existing area of raised decking, which would abut the party boundary with the adjoining semidetached dwelling and would project by 4m from the main rear elevation of the dwelling. This extension would have a flat roof which would be 3.15m high. Bi-fold doors would lead onto a new area of decking which is shown to be 0.3m high.

A rear dormer extension is proposed, which would be set within the extended roofslope and would be set in from the party boundary between the host property

and the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and 3.75m from the other flank gable wall.

# Consultations

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

# **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

## Planning History

Under reference 12/03857 an application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for a single storey side extension was refused.

Part retrospective planning permission was granted under reference 13/00367 for a single storey rear/side extension.

Planning permission was refused under reference 15/03374 for extensions similar to those currently proposed in terms of their siting and scope. Permission was refused on the grounds that

"The proposed extension would result in an obtrusive and top-heavy roof design which would be incongruous and harmful to the appearance of the pair of semidetached dwellings and would be out of character with and detrimental to the street scene generally, thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan."

## 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 seeks to overcome the grounds for refusal in respect of the previous scheme.

The main differences between the current scheme and that which was refused planning permission under reference 15/03374 is the provision of a partially hipped roof rather than a gable end to the two storey side element.

With regards to the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of the area, it is considered that the two storey side element of the proposal would not harm the amenities of the neighbouring property. The proposed flank facing window would be obscure glazed and the proposal would have a limited impact on daylight, sunlight and outlook and would be acceptable in this respect. The flank facing

window in the side extension which was granted planning permission under reference 15/00793 serves a utility room and the door is a side kitchen door, with the kitchen lit by two further and substantial rear windows.

The dormer extension is of modest proportions and would lie comfortably within the rear roofslope. It would not increase the potential for overlooking to neighbouring properties to a significant degree.

The proposed single storey extension would be reasonably deep and immediately abuts the boundary of the site. In addition, the orientation of the dwellings in relation to each other, with the proposed extension positioned due south of the neighbouring property, would increase potential for loss of daylight and sunlight to the rear of the adjoining dwelling. However, the neighbouring property has a retractable awning set within a framed structure, and it is considered on balance that the impact of the proposal on the amenities of the neighbouring property would not be so adverse as to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

The proposed extension would not incorporate the minimum 1m side space to the boundary that Policy H9 normally requires, the purpose of which is to retain adequate side space between two storey development with a view to preventing unrelated terracing. A minimum side space of 0.9m is shown to be retained at the rear of the side extension.

The neighbouring property has a wraparound side/rear extension under construction, with space retained at first floor level. That side extension has been built to the same building line as the garage (0.75m from the boundary fence) and is single storey only, retaining space at first floor level to the boundary.

On balance, it is considered that the shortfall in side space at the rear of the extension would not in itself represent strong grounds for refusal, taking into account the retention of first floor space between Nos. 23 and 25 and the provision of 1m side space at the front of the property.

Planning permission was refused for the erection of a side extension at No. 6 Braemar Gardens on the grounds that inadequate side space would have been provided. In that case, a side space of 0.9m was shown to be retained. A subsequent appeal against the Council's decision was allowed, with the Inspector noting that the gap retained between the boundaries would be reflective of many other examples found within the street scene, and that the development was in accordance with Policy H9.

A number of properties in the locality have been the subject of extensions to the side and at roof level. In general those extended at two storey level to the side have retained the hipped design of the main roof. The adjoining semi-detached dwelling has a hipped roof which is subservient to the main roof by being set lower than the main ridgeline, although it is acknowledged that that extension resulted in the loss of the attractive and characteristic first floor oriel window.

Two dwellings in the street which neighbour each other and have gable end roofs are Nos. 39 and 41. These extensions were granted planning permission in 1998

and 2003 respectively and are considered to be a material consideration in the determination of this application.

The existing symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings has been compromised to a certain extent by the erection of a two storey extension at the adjoining property. The deletion of the gable end element reduces the extent to which the proposal would appear top-heavy and incongruous. On balance, it is considered (taking into account the variety of roof treatments in the locality and the reduction in bulk at roof level resulting from the provision of hipped roof) that the appearance of the proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the area.

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 area.

## **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 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed first floor window in the southern flank elevation shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy Level 3 and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and the window shall subsequently be permanently retained in accordance as such.

**REASON:** In the interest of the residential amenities of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.