

## **SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration**

**Application No :** 16/00262/RECON

**Ward:**  
**West Wickham**

**Address :** 7 Barnfield Wood Close Beckenham  
BR3 6SY

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 538793 N: 167280

**Applicant :** Mr D McCool

**Objections :** YES

### **Description of Development:**

Variation of condition 10 of permission Ref. No. 11/03853 to allow the erection of a green house to the side. (Part retrospective).

Key designations:

Smoke Control SCA 2

### **Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a detached greenhouse adjacent to the host dwelling. The application is retrospective in part as the block work for the base walls of the proposed greenhouse has already been constructed.

The proposed outbuilding would be located at the back of the existing off-street car parking hardstanding, separated from the hardstanding by a hedge.

Plans submitted with the application show that the resultant outbuilding would be 3.9m high to the ridge of the pitched roof, and 2.44m high to the eaves. The applicant has provided additional written confirmation that the building would be 3.9m high. The bottom 0.88m of the walls would be constructed of concrete blockwork, with the remaining walls, front and rear gables and roof constructed of laminated glass with the ridgeline constructed of lead.

The blockwork base of the greenhouse has been constructed adjacent to a planted garden bed which separates the proposed outbuilding from the retained parking area. Measurements provided show that the depth of the retained parking area in front of the garden bed ranges in depth from 4.86m to 6.71m.

The greenhouse would be 3.91m deep and 3.194m wide and would be orientated so that the front elevation of the outbuilding would face the flank elevation of the host dwelling, with the side elevation of the greenhouse facing the cul-de-sac.

The application documents include a photograph showing the original dwelling and site, and the siting of a car port between the flank garage wall of the host dwelling and the boundary.

## Location

The greenhouse would be sited to the south of the existing dwellinghouse. A separation of 1.22m would be retained between the flank wall of the dwelling and the flank wall of the proposed outbuilding.

Barnfield Wood Close is a residential cul-de-sac accessed from Barnfield Wood Road. A total of 7 dwellings are sited within the cul-de-sac, with the host dwelling the only property on the western side of the street. The remaining dwellings are arranged on the eastern side of the road, with the exception of No 6 which lies at the southern extent of the close. The prevailing pattern of development in the close is of two storey dwellings of traditional design with off street car parking within the respective residential curtilages. The close is narrow with a turning head at the end, opposite No. 6 and there is no footway within the cul-de-sac adjacent to the application site.

The application site comprises a reasonably recently constructed replacement dwelling which was granted planning permission under reference 11/03853 and which lies directly adjacent to the Park Langley Golf Club to the rear. The site has a number of tall mature trees.

Parking for the host dwelling is located on the L-shaped hardstanding to the south of the main dwelling, next to the juvenile hedge which is adjacent to the proposed outbuilding.

The property is adjacent to but not within the Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character. The application site adjoins a golf course which is designated as Metropolitan Open Land.

## **Consultations**

Comments from local residents

A number of letters of objection have been received from residents within Barnfield Wood Close which can be summarised below:

- The planning application should be seen in the context of the previous planning applications
- There is a history of applications made for less significant structures than have actually been built
- The proposed structure has the dimensions of a much larger building, with the height coming up to halfway up the roof of the main house.
- The proposal is only 0.9m lower than the garage which was refused planning permission, and twice the height of usual greenhouses
- Internal stairs or steps would be required as would an upper platform in order to fully utilise the structure
- The erection of storage units inside would effectively present the same visual impact as a solid building
- The proposal would block out the last remaining space between development on this side of the close

- The proposal would result in the loss of parking space, with the permission under 11/03853 allowing the parking of 3 cars, and the enclosure that has been built clearly not leaving enough space for the vehicles which are parked there regularly
- The street has little parking and only a narrow turning head, and protruding vehicles present a hazard
- The proposal would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site and a lowering of spatial standards in the area
- A large box van often uses the parking space
- The previous application was refused because of the impact on parking
- The area should be reinstated as hardstanding to increase the amount of parking available
- The greenhouse should be located at the rear and would become an eyesore if erected at the side of the property.

No technical highways objections are raised regarding the proposal.

## **Planning Considerations**

### Unitary Development Plan

Policies BE1, H8, T3 and T18 are of particular relevance to the determination of the application:

Policy BE1 relates to the design of new development and requires that all development proposals should be of a high standard of design and layout. Development should complement the form, materials and layout of adjacent buildings and areas and should not detract from the street scene. It should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings.

Policy H8 relates to residential extensions and requires that the scale, form and materials should respect or complement those of the host dwelling, being compatible with the surrounding area. Space and gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.

Policy T3 relates to parking and Policy T18 relates to road safety, stating that in determining planning applications the Council will consider the potential impact on road safety.

### The London Plan

Policy 7.4 (Local Character) of the London Plan states that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area.

### National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraph 56 of the NPPF is of particular relevance to the determination of this application, stating that great importance is attached to the design of the built environment, emphasising that good design is a key aspect of sustainable

development. Development should contribute positively to making places better for people.

### Planning History

The site has an extensive recent planning history which is summarised below:

Under reference 11/03853 planning permission was granted for the demolition of the original bungalow and the erection of the replacement detached three bedroom single storey dwelling that currently occupies the site. The proposal included the provision of accommodation in the roofspace and a one bedroom annex as well as car parking and a refuse and cycle store.

Planning permission was subject to a number of conditions, including condition 8 which required that the parking spaces be completed in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained as such thereafter. Condition 10 removed permitted development rights conferred by Classes A, B, C, and E of the General Permitted Development Order, 1995.

The permitted dwelling largely followed the footprint of the then existing bungalow albeit at a higher maximum height.

Under reference 13/00267 planning permission was refused for the erection of a detached single storey garage at the side of the property on the grounds:

- 1. The proposed garage by reason of its size, height and siting on this redeveloped plot of restricted dimensions would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site which would lead to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards and character of the area and detrimental to residential and the visual amenities of the street scene contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.**
- 2. The proposal does not comply with the Council's standards for off-street car parking provision in that the proposed garage will result in the loss of a space for a dwelling of this size in this area of low accessibility, and insufficient room would be left between the front of the garage and the highway for the satisfactory parking of a car clear of the highway. As such, it is likely that there will be an increased demand for on-street parking which would thus constitute a potential obstruction impacting upon the free flow of traffic within this narrow close, inconvenient to other road users, pedestrians and local residents, contrary to Policies T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.**
- 3. The development would be likely to impact upon the root protection area and therefore prejudice the retention and well-being of two trees on the adjacent property which are considered to make an important contribution to the visual amenities of the cul de sac, and their loss would be detrimental to the amenities of the area as a whole, contrary to Policies NE7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.**

The proposed garage would have been sited a minimum of 1m from the flank wall of the main dwelling, set back from the front corner of the house by approx. 2.9m. The garage was proposed to be sited 0.2m from the side boundary with No. 7. The retained paved driveway was shown to have a depth of 2.25m increasing to approx. 4.5m adjacent to the dwelling. The garage would have had a pitched roof with a ridge height of 4.5m and an eaves height of 2.25m. The garage was orientated to face the cul-de-sac, with the ridgeline of the building running perpendicular to the main flank elevation of the host dwelling.

## **Conclusions**

The main issues in the determination of this application are the impact of the proposal on the residential and visual amenities of the area, in addition to the extent to which the proposal would allow the retention of a satisfactory parking area to serve the needs of the host dwelling.

In assessing the merits of the proposal it is appropriate to consider whether the current proposal overcomes the grounds for refusal relating to the previously proposed single storey garage at the side of the dwelling, in providing development of a scale and siting appropriate to the host dwelling.

The space between the bungalow and the boundary affords views between built development to the golf course beyond and is considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

The garage would be orientated to face the host dwelling presenting a side-on view to the street, unlike the previously refused garage scheme in which the ridgeline was parallel with the main flank elevation of the dwelling. This orientation would increase the extent to which the bulk of the building would infill the existing space between the bungalow and the boundary. The main bulk of the greenhouse would be appreciable from the street, with the gable ends and 3.9m high ridge more effectively infilling the existing space between the boundary and the flank elevation of the bungalow than the garage which was previously refused planning permission.

It is considered that the gable ends would contrast unfavourably to the rhythm of the street scene on this side of the cul-de-sac, where the deeply pitched roof of the host replacement dwelling slopes down towards the boundary, complementing the similar slope of the adjacent garage and increasing the spaciousness at first floor level between built development.

It is noted that the proposed greenhouse would be lower than the garage which was previously refused planning permission, and that the structure would be substantially glazed which would somewhat mitigate its visual impact. The overall height of the outbuilding would be 0.6m lower than the maximum height of the garage which was refused planning permission. These aspects of the development represent a qualified improvement over the previously refused development.

It is considered, however, that the design and appearance of the greenhouse would represent an alien and jarring feature in the street scene, out of character

with the pattern of development in its materials and form in relation to the adjacent buildings. It would be set back from the main front elevation but due to the openness of the area between the host dwelling and the neighbouring property would be clearly appreciable within the street scene, from the cul-de-sac and dwellings opposite the site. On this basis, it is not considered that the proposal meets the aims of the NPPF, the London Plan and the Unitary Development Plan policies which seek to ensure that new development complements the pattern and grain of development in residential areas.

It is acknowledged that the applicant has submitted photographs showing the previous car port which was adjacent to the original bungalow, subsequently replaced by the existing host dwelling. In the redevelopment of the original residential plot, the retention of space around the building as well as the pitched roof and gable features which broke up the massing of the building were taken into account in permitting the erection of a generally more bulky and prominent replacement dwelling. As the site is currently developed, the existing space between the bulk of the dwelling and the adjacent garage in the neighbouring plot is considered to contribute positively to the visual amenities of the area. The enclosure of this space would undermine these visual amenities in reducing the openness provided on this side of the cul-de-sac balances the more prominent siting of the host bungalow in relation to the cul-de-sac in contrast with the remaining dwellings in the close.

In assessing the merits of the proposal it is necessary to consider whether the use of appropriate planning conditions could safeguard the residential and visual amenities of the area, rendering the development acceptable. While it would be possible to condition that the greenhouse be erected in complete accordance with the submitted plans, with glazing above the already constructed blockwork walls, the imposition of a condition which would restrict the internal configuration of the space, the installation of shelving within the building for example, may be considered unreasonably onerous in the context of the full and practicable use of the greenhouse.

With regards to the impact of the proposal on the retention of adequate space for parking to serve the needs of the host dwelling, it is acknowledged that the retained parking area is of quite restricted dimensions, falling below the minimum depth normally required for end-on parking spaces towards the side boundary of the site. It is noted that neighbouring residents have raised concerns regarding the parking of a commercial vehicle. However, on balance it is considered that while shallower in parts than would normally be considered acceptable, the retained parking area would not usually be insufficient in providing 2 car parking spaces to serve the needs of the host dwelling. While the parking of a large van within the site would be impracticable, that would equally have been the case under the parking provisions as originally indicated in the application for the replacement dwelling. It is not therefore considered that the refusal of planning permission on the grounds of the impact on the provision of on-site parking would be appropriate.

No technical highways objections are raised to the proposal and it is not therefore considered that the refusal of planning permission on the highways grounds relevant to refusal 13/00267 would be appropriate.

The impact of the proposal on the retention of trees adjacent to the site is not considered to provide strong grounds for refusal of planning permission. The trees are not protected and the base area of the greenhouse does not significantly differ from the original parking hardstanding area. The greenhouse base does not extend as deeply into the site as the previously refused garage.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED**

**The reasons for refusal are:**

- 1 The proposed greenhouse by reason of its height, size and siting on this redeveloped plot of restricted dimensions would result in a cramped and alien appearance, out of character with the spatial standards and appearance of the site and the area in general and detrimental to visual amenity thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.**