

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

Application No : 16/02810/FULL6

Ward:
Kelsey And Eden Park

Address : 33 Greenways Beckenham BR3 3NQ

OS Grid Ref: E: 537381 N: 168994

Applicant : Mr Novica Jevric

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer and three roof lights to front roof slope, single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and elevational alterations.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 18

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for roof alterations to incorporate first floor side extension, three roof lights to front roof slope, single storey rear extension and rear dormer extension. Demolition of the existing conservatory, garage and car port is also proposed.

The proposed first floor extension would be situated above the existing study and would span the full depth of the host dwelling and would incorporate a hipped roof at a 60 degree angle. The rear dormer extension would measure 3m in depth x 5.1m in width x 2.5m in height. The proposed single storey rear extension is L-shaped and would measure 3.6m in depth & 2.8m (closest to the adjoining neighbour), 9.1m in width x 3.7m in height.

Location

The application site comprises one half of a pair of two storey semi-detached properties located on the north eastern side of Greenways, Beckenham. The property is of brick and tile construction and benefits from a front drive and car port. The surrounding area is residential in character with housing of varying architectural styles.

The application is a revised scheme following the refusal of planning permission under planning application reference:- 15/04063.

Consultations

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

- the plans submitted in this new application are not materially changed. We object on the following basis: 1. The plans submitted are a refresh of the previously refused application & the developer has not addressed the council conclusion that 'the proposed first floor side extension & roof alterations by reason of its design, prominent siting, scale & mass would harm the open & spacious setting of the street scene & would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the host & adjoining dwelling contrary Policies BE1 & H8 of the Unitary Development Plan & SPG1 General Design principles & SPG2 Residential Design Guidance'.
- The new plans additionally introduce 3 front facing rooflight velux windows at the street side of the house which are untypical in the traditional style & character of the house & are not in keeping with the street scene.
- The council 'Delegated Decision' report on the previous application (dated 13th January 2016) specifically highlights areas of concern, aligned to various neighbour objections: The proposed side first floor extension '...would narrow the gap between the neighbouring buildings to an unacceptable degree, harmful to the spacious & open setting of the street scene'. The change of roofline & side extension '... would unbalance the symmetry of the property with its neighbour which is an intrinsic character of the building whole'. The design & mass of the proposed plans relating to the side extension & roof profile from the street view have not changed & remain out of keeping with the building & the street scene.
- The development proposed is to one half of the host building; the left side of a semi-detached property of matched symmetry. No plans/drawings to highlight the change/impact or context in relation to the whole building have been submitted. The change in mass and style of No.33 would result in its mismatching the other half of the semi-detached as well as the existing street scene, character and appearance.
- The boundary lines between No. 31 and No. 33 are unusual due to a long ago sale of a slim parcel of land only between the houses (to facilitate improved side access for No. 33). This does not extend to either front or rear gardens and accordingly the boundary angles in favour of No.31 both in front of and behind No 33. The plans do not clarify nor give reference/measurement points to establish impact of the proposed rear extension development on the actual boundary (e.g. proximity of proposed extended full width rear extension to boundary at point of extension). Relevant as both gardens have a steep incline downwards from the houses, meaning in real terms the rear extension will be significantly higher (level footing to house estimated as circa 1 metre above ground height). No height measurement of the proposed extended full width ground floor rear extension is given in the plans.
- The proposed development continues to feature a significant side extension at first floor level (to fill-in the 1930's chalet style roof shape & extend the existing ground level narrow 'porch' like ground floor side: Front corner of house changed to full house height, protruding circa 1 metre out in front of No 31, breaching the house line of the street and significantly changing visual separation of the houses. Vast expanse of flat wall (over 9.3 metres

long at full house height with an additional ground floor 3.6 metre deep rear extension) out of keeping with the street style and scale of other houses, which will dominate the view in approach up street. Addition of 1st floor level and a standard roof shape will directly result in overshadowing of neighbours, taking light from existing windows & a repositioning of the existing recessed window to new extended wall line will bring this an estimated 2.5 metres closer to directly face into existing windows of No.31 and significantly impact privacy Closing of the gap between the houses not only changes the character and style but also means a loss of daylight and direct sunlight which will darken and put into shadow the North Eastern facing back of our house and the garden

- The proposed 2nd floor rear roof extension is also overbearing, using the side changes to facilitate an even greater expansion to the roof overlooking all our gardens. This contributes to the general massing of the proposed new building and disproportionate domination of the space adjacent to our house. The proposed change to the roofline is not in keeping with the tradition of the house style; no other such extensions are visible from street/our gardens and of concern is that this additionally risks setting an uncomfortable precedence out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street which has been stalwartly maintained to date. We would also highlight that the proposed rear extension seems to similarly extend further out than other extensions for the same reason. We would ask that this aspect be considered in the overall review.
- The changes proposed to No.33 are excessive and the scale of change to the property in itself is cause for objection as it seems disproportionate & will overwhelm the other side of the semi detached. It also raises question of appropriateness in a densely populated area where parking is a problem and water run-off is material.
- I am pleased that the previous application was rejected on the grounds stated. This one is better although it will affect the symmetry with the neighbouring house and the character of the street. I do object to the Velux Windows in the front roof. Although this is not a conservation area, I feel it is important that development keeps to the style and character of the street. Velux windows to the front are not appropriate.

Highways - the site is location has a PTAL rating of 3 (moderate) and the proposal would not alter the amount of off-street parking, at least 3 spaces, available on the site. There are no objections from a highway point of view.

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
H9 Side Space

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 - General Design Principles
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 - Residential Design Guidance

The London Plan and national Planning Policy Framework are also key considerations in the determination of this application.

The above policies are considered to be consistent with the principles and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Planning History

Under planning application reference: 15/04063 planning permission was refused for roof extension to incorporate rear dormer and single storey rear extension. The application was refused for the following reason:-

"The proposed first floor side extension and roof alterations by reason of its design, prominent siting, scale and mass would harm the open and spacious setting of the streetscene and would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the host and adjoining dwelling contrary Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and SPG 1 General Design Principles & SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance".

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

Following the refusal of the previous planning permission (reference:- 15/04063) the applicant has made several changes to the proposal; hipping the roof in so it appears more symmetrical with the existing roof profile and that of the neighbours at No.35; reducing the size of the rear dormer extension bringing the height down from the ridge and up from the eaves but now appearing wider. The single storey rear extension has also been reduced in depth from 3.9m to 3.7m nearest to the common boundary with No.31. A depth of 2.8m is the same to the common boundary with No.35.

Policy BE1 of the UDP requires new buildings to complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas, and seeks to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Policy H8 of the UDP requires residential extensions to blend with the style and materials of the host dwelling, and ensure that spaces or gaps between buildings are respected where these contribute to the character of the area.

Policy H9 of the UDP requires that when considering applications for new residential development, including extensions, the Council will normally require for a proposal of two or more storeys in height, a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site should be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building or where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space. This will be the case on some corner properties.

Design

As a semi-detached property it is important to consider whether the proposal would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings or appear unduly bulky and top heavy in the context of the host dwelling. The proposed first floor side extension would be situated above the existing study and would be flush with the existing front building line. The changes to the roof design are now considered to more closely resemble that of a hipped roof design and in character with that of the other semi-detached property.

On balance it is considered that the roof design would not have a significantly adverse impact on the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings or the visual amenities of the street scene such that would warrant the refusal of planning permission. It is however noted from the site visit that surrounding properties remain unextended at first floor level.

The proposed single storey extension would be located to the rear and the property not visible from the public realm. The overall size and design is considered acceptable and in keeping with the host dwelling. In relation to the proposed dormer extension this too is located to the rear and the dimensions proposed are considered acceptable.

Neighbouring amenity

Policy BE1 seeks to ensure that new development proposals, including residential extensions respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and that their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing.

The main impact of the proposal would be on No 35 Greenways which is located to the south of the application site. The proposed rear extension would abut the common boundary with this property; however the depth of the extension on this side is modest at 2.8m. The single storey extension would not be significantly deeper than the existing conservatory at the host dwelling.

The first floor of the proposed first floor extension would be set away from the flank party boundary with sufficient separation retained to limit the impact of this part of the proposals on the residential amenities of the adjoining dwelling No.31.

Whilst a new window is proposed to the side at first floor this can be obscure glazed being a bathroom. The size and position of the first floor addition would add additional bulk and mass to the property but on balance isn't considered to give rise to a loss of privacy or overlooking. In relation to the rear dormer extension, there is already an established degree of overlooking from the rear first floor windows and the additional dormer would not give rise to a greater degree of overlooking.

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 any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided at the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 6.9 of the London Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

- 5** Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window(s) shall be obscure glazed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.