

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

Application No : 15/03847/FULL1

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : 1 Canterbury Close Beckenham BR3
5EP

OS Grid Ref: E: 537674 N: 169844

Applicant : Mr Dean D'Eye

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
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

The determination of this application was deferred by Members of the Plans Sub Committee on 7th January 2016 in order to seek the removal of the second door and to address the potential for the self-containment of the accommodation. Members were concerned that the layout and door configuration would make it reasonably easy to sever the extension from the host dwelling to form a separate self-contained dwelling.

Revised plans have been received which incorporate the deletion of the existing front door which was shown to be retained to access the guest bedroom (the re-configured space lying within the footprint of the existing dwelling rather than in the extension). A new front-facing door is proposed to be provided in the existing front elevation.

In addition, the applicants have submitted a sunlight study.

The previous report is repeated (suitably amended) below:

It is proposed to erect a two storey side extension to the host dwelling. The two storey extension would abut the flank boundary of the site and would align with the main front and rear elevations of the existing dwelling. No windows are proposed to

the flank elevation of the extension. The side element of the extension would be 3m wide, and would replace the existing single storey garage.

At the rear, a single storey extension is proposed which would be 3.3m deep and which would have a flat roof 2.7m high. The single storey extension would abut the flank boundary with the adjoining property and would continue the extended flank elevation.

As originally submitted, the application incorporated an externally sited flue and a roof terrace over part of the single storey rear extension. These elements have been deleted from the scheme.

Location

Canterbury Close is a residential cul-de-sac accessed from The Avenue. The street is characterised by flat-roofed two storey terraced houses arranged to the north and south of the cul-de-sac. The application site comprises the easternmost end-of-terrace dwelling. Adjacent to the host dwelling is an open grassed area. The existing dwelling incorporates a single storey garage between the main two storey bulk of the dwelling and the boundary with the open grassed area. The soft landscaping of the open area extends along the eastern side of the cul-de-sac access from The Avenue, and these open and soft landscaped spaces contribute to the character and appearance of the street scene by softening the appearance of the residential cul-de-sac.

Consultations

Local residents

Neighbouring owners/occupiers were notified of the application and the representations received in response can be summarised:

- loss of privacy as a result of overlooking from the terrace, to neighbouring residential gardens and the public green
- there are gaps running around the privacy screen and the height is insufficient
- the opaque side panel could be removed without permission allowing the whole of the roof of the extension to be used as a terrace
- no other dwellings in the street have been extended in this manner
- overdevelopment of the site, out of character with the width of the existing dwellings in the cul-de-sac
- lack of side space to the open space
- the internal layout resembles a student hostel, while the street comprises only family dwellings
- creation of a multi-occupancy dwelling
- restrictive covenants
- lack of detail on the plans of foul drainage, guttering and roof drainage
- the proposal would result in bathrooms/toilets adjacent to party walls and macerators may be required
- creation of a foul sewage outlet close to the boundary

- insufficient detail of the screening to the terrace
- loss of light
- inaccurate plans
- the extension would align with the boundary of the site
- the flue has not been included in the daylight study
- the number of bathrooms would indicate that the development is not sustainable development
- noise and disturbance to neighbouring dwelling occasioned by the use of the bathrooms adjacent to the party boundary

Neighbouring owners/occupiers were notified of the submission of revised plans. In response, comments have been received from a neighbouring resident withdrawing the objection originally raised on the basis of the removal of the rear balcony area. A further letter has been received, reiterating concerns regarding the scale of the resultant accommodation.

Comments from Consultees

Thames Water have commented on the proposal, stating that with regards to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. It is recommended that the applicant ensures that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest to the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval will be required. It is further recommended, with regards to building work within 3m of pipes, that the developer contact Thames Water for further information.

There are no objections regarding the sewerage or water infrastructure capacities of the development.

From a technical highways perspective, the proposed garage is substandard. However there are spaces available within the site's curtilage which would be utilised for parking, and therefore there are no objections to the proposal.

Planning Considerations

In determining planning applications, the starting point is the development plan and any other material considerations that are relevant. The adopted development plan in this case includes the Bromley Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2006 Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 & 2, the London Plan and The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

NPPF

Section 7: Requiring good design is of particular relevance to the determination of this application.

UDP

Relevant policies in the UDP are as follows:

Policy H8	Residential extensions
Policy H9	Side Space
Policy T3	Parking
Policy BE1	Design of New Development

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) documents are also a consideration in the determination of planning applications. These are:

SPG No.1 - General Design Principles
SPG No.2 - Residential Design Guidance

London Plan

London Plan Policies:

3.5 Quality and Design of Housing Developments
7.4 Local Character

Planning History

There is no relevant planning history to report.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are considered to be the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities and character of the street scene and the residential amenities of neighbouring residents. A number of additional concerns have been identified by local residents and listed in the consultations section of this report.

Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan requires that for proposals of 2 or more storeys in height a minimum of 1m side space shall be retained to the flank boundary, and greater standards of separation will be required in areas with a more spacious character. The proposed two storey extension would not provide a 1m space as set out in Policy H9.

However, the siting of the proposed extension adjacent to an open grassed area would limit the impact of the non-compliant extension on the spaciousness of the area, and the proposal would not result in the adverse impacts of loss of spaciousness and unrelated terracing that Policy H9 seeks to avoid.

It is not considered that the design and appearance of the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the street scene. While the proposal would extend the width of the host dwelling, the visual context within which the extension would be viewed would relate to a long terrace of dwellings

within which alterations to the fenestration and the materials used for the elevations of the individual properties is not wholly uniform.

It is considered that the proposed two storey extension relates reasonably well to the general rhythm and appearance of the terrace in terms of its scale, height, massing and design. While it is noted that there is a general consistency in the width of dwellings in the cul-de-sac, the existing staggering of the front elevation of the terraced dwelling limits the extent to which the proposed extension would appear jarring or incongruous.

With regards to the single storey element, the proposed extension would immediately abut the boundary with the adjoining terraced dwelling, and would lie to the east of that property. As such the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of the adjacent dwelling, including daylight and outlook should be very carefully considered. The depth of the extension, at 3.3m, is not considered excessive or unusually deep.

The applicant has submitted a daylight and sunlight analysis which it is stated demonstrates that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on amenity. This analysis shows that there would be a slightly increased shadow to the neighbouring property as a consequence of the extension.

The impact of the proposal on the daylight and sunlight to the rear facing windows of No.3 would be inherently related to the height of the sheer flank wall adjacent to that property. As scaled from the submitted elevations, it appears that the height would be approx. 2.7m and that the proposed extension would be approx. 1m higher than the boundary fence height. On balance, and taking into account the reasonably modest depth and height above fence line of the extension, it is not considered that the impact of the proposal on daylight and sunlight would be so adverse as to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

A number of representations have been received which raise concern regarding the drainage (foul and surface water) from the proposed extension. It is considered that if permission is granted, a condition could be imposed requiring more detailed information to be submitted, and Building Regulations approval will additionally be required which may address concerns relating to the construction of the extension.

The submitted plans show the formation within the existing ground floor of a guest suite, and the provision of three first floor bedrooms. The application is for the extension of a self-contained dwelling house and there has been no suggestion by the applicant that it is intended that the dwelling be used as a hostel. The provision of a guest bedroom is not considered likely to result in the over-intensive or uncharacteristic use of the extended house being used other than as a self-contained dwelling. The guest suite is located within the fabric of the existing dwelling and the proposed extension would not be easily capable of separation for use as a self-contained dwelling. The rearrangement of the front access to the property shown in the revised plans is considered to further limit the potential for severance.

On balance, the proposed extensions to the property would not be disproportionate, detrimental to the visual amenities of the area, nor would they be significantly detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. On this basis it is recommended that planning permission be granted for the proposed development.

as amended by documents received on 14.09.2015 12.10.2015 07.12.2015
08.12.2015 and 09.12.2015

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 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 Details of a surface water drainage system (including storage facilities where necessary) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved system shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage and to accord with Policy ER13 of the Unitary Development Plan.

5 Details of a foul water drainage system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is commenced and the approved system shall be completed before any part of the development hereby permitted is first

occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: To ensure satisfactory means of foul water drainage and to accord with Policy ER13 of the Unitary Development Plan.

6 The flat roof of the single storey rear extension shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area and there shall be no access to the roof area.

REASON: In the interest of the privacy of neighbouring residents and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan

7 Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include measures of how construction traffic can access the site safely and how potential traffic conflicts can be minimised; the route construction traffic shall follow for arriving at and leaving the site and the hours of operation, but shall not be limited to these. The Construction Management Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T5, T6, T7, T15, T16 & T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

8 Before commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted parking spaces and/or garages and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (England) 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.