

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

**Application No :** 16/02461/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Penge And Cator**

**Address :** 83 Kings Hall Road, Beckenham  
BR3 1LR

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 536329 N: 169950

**Applicant :** Mr Jaymeen Patel

**Objections :** YES

### **Description of Development:**

Single storey rear extension

### **Key designations:**

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
Flood Zone 2  
Green Chain  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Metropolitan Open Land  
Smoke Control SCA 25

### **Proposal**

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension which will replace the existing single storey structure to the rear. It will extend between approximately 7m and 6.6m in depth from the rear of the two storey section of the main dwelling (approximately an additional 4m to 4.8m beyond the rear of the existing single storey structure). The deeper part of the extension adjacent to no. 85 will have a flat roof to a height of 3.9m. This part of the extension will extend the full width of the dwelling for a depth of 2.1m before stepping down to a flat roof with a height of 3m for a 2m wide section of the extension adjacent to no. 81. This 3m high part of the extension will also have a depth of approximately 0.4m less than the 3.9m high part of the extension. A chimney which will extend to a height of 4.5m and will conceal a flue to the proposed gas fireplace within the new living accommodation provided by the extension is also proposed within the middle of the extension.

The extension is shown to be constructed of brickwork similar to the existing house with the flat roof being a sedum green roof. The extension will provide an enlarged kitchen and living space.

A statement in support of the application was received from the agent on 08.08.16 along with a Comparative Impact Study and revised plan as viewed from no. 81. The revised plan does not show any changes to the proposed extension. All documents are available on file.

## **Location**

The application site consists of a large two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the northern side of Kings Hall Road, Beckenham. The property lies adjacent to the Aldersmead Road Conservation Area which borders the rear of the site. The property lies within Flood Zone 2.

## **Consultations**

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

- Loss of outlook
- Loss of privacy
- Out of character with other properties in the road
- The new chimney and roof will be level with neighbouring balcony

A letter of support was also received from the occupiers of no. 81 Kings Hall Road, which also stated the following points;

- Measures to be included to remove the risk of damp ingress through the party wall
- Materials should be consistent with the existing
- The fireplace should not burn fuel whose smoke/emissions could cause a nuisance

Any further comments received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

## **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  
BE13 Development Adjacent to a Conservation Area  
H8 Residential Extensions  
NE7 Development and Trees

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

## **Planning History**

Under ref: 16/00250/HHPA a prior approval application for a larger home extension comprising a Single storey rear extension, extending beyond the rear wall of the original house by 5.36m, for which the maximum height would be 3.9m, and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m, under the 42 Day Notification for Householder Permitted Development Prior Approval process was refused as the application did not comply with the permitted development legislation.

Under ref: 15/05613/FULL6, planning permission was refused for a two storey side extension.

## **Conclusions**

The application has been called in to committee by the ward councillors. The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area in general and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

Policies H8, BE1 and the Council's Supplementary design guidance seek to ensure that new development, including residential extensions are of a high quality design that respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development. Policy BE1 also 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 loss of outlook or overshadowing.

The application dwelling, like many of the neighbouring properties, has an existing part brick/part glazed single storey structure to the rear, which appears to be original and is a feature of both the adjoining semi at no. 81 and the semi's at no's 73/75 and 77/79. The extension would extend between about 4m and 4.8m further to the rear than existing. The original part of the dwelling is to be removed and the resultant extension would be a single storey development which is now a total of 7m in depth from the two storey element of the main dwelling. In addition, the majority of the proposed extension would have a flat roof to a height of 3.9m, with the part of the proposal having a reduced height of 3m being limited to a 2m wide, 4.5m long section adjacent to no. 81. Accordingly, the proposal will result in a substantial development to the rear of the site. Furthermore, the inclusion of a chimney element 4.5m high within the middle of the extension would provide increased bulk.

The property is one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings which lies within a set of 3 pairs of semis of a similar size and design. The extension would be substantially larger than the existing development to the rear of these properties and thus would be at odds with the surrounding character of development. It is noted that the statement of support from the agent received 08.08.16 outlines that the extension would not extend further to the rear than the adjacent flatted development at Knights Court and gives its location would not be visible from the public realm. However, this property is of a differing design and layout to that of the three sets of semi's and despite its location at the rear Member's must still consider the impact on the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling and area in general. Therefore, whilst not visible from the street, the cumulative impact of both the excessive depth and height of the proposed extension is considered to result in a development which is bulky and overbearing and would not respect the existing scale and form of the host dwelling and surrounding development and as such would be contrary to the aims and objectives of Policies H8 and BE1 of the UDP.

Adjacent to the neighbouring semi at no. 81, the extension would have a flat roof to a height of 3.9m for the first 2.1m in depth before reducing down to 3m for the remaining 4.5m. There is an existing party wall which serves a small single storey extension at no. 81 and the existing glazed extension at no. 83 which extends to this depth of 2.1m and a height of around 4.1m. As such, this part of the proposal will not cause any impact to the amenities of the adjoining property at no. 81. However, the proposal would still extend a further 4.5m beyond the rear of this adjoining property for a height of 3m.

It is noted that comments were received from the occupiers of this adjoining dwelling which stated support of the proposal as outlined in the section above. However, the Council must also consider the amenity of future occupants. The rear of the neighbouring property which is adjacent to the application site, sits slightly higher than the garden and as such the height of the proposed extension would appear lower when viewed from this rear doorway. In addition, both neighbouring properties benefit from north facing rear gardens and therefore given this orientation of the properties, the extension is unlikely to result in any significant loss of light. The existing boundary between the properties is occupied by mature vegetation. However, some of which it would appear would need to be removed or cut back to facilitate the proposed extension. Therefore, taking into account all the above, and notwithstanding the visual impact of the proposed development due its bulk and scale, it is not considered to result in any significant harm to the amenities of this adjoining property as to warrant a refusal of planning permission on this basis.

The extension would not extend any further to the rear than the flatted development at Knights Court and would retain separation to the side boundary with this neighbouring property. The flank windows are high level and as such would not provide any additional opportunities for overlooking. Concerns have been raised by an occupier of one of the first floor flats within Knights Court with regards to loss of light and outlook which are noted. However, given the siting of the extension in relation to this neighbouring development it is not considered to give rise to any undue harm to the amenities of this neighbouring property.

Two trees are shown to be removed as part of the proposal. The trees do not currently benefit from any protection and their removal is not considered to be unacceptable.

Having had regard to all the above, Members may consider that the depth and height of the proposed extension is not acceptable, in that it would fail to respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and surrounding development, and would therefore be harmful to the character of the area and contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED**

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed extension, by reason of its depth, height and bulk, would result in an overly dominant and overbearing addition to the host dwelling, which would fail to respect the existing scale and form of the host dwelling and surrounding development and would be harmful to the character of the area in general, thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of the UDP.**