

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

Application No : 16/02892/FULL6

Ward:
Clock House

Address : 31 Turners Meadow Way, Beckenham
BR3 4TB

OS Grid Ref: E: 536716 N: 169816

Applicant : Mr Richard Sibley

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey side extension to include conversion of garage to habitable accommodation

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

The application seeks consent for a single-storey side extension and conversion of the existing garage into habitable accommodation. The extension would be located to the front of the existing garage and would add 2.65m to its overall depth. This would now measure 8.1m in depth. The extension would have a pitched roof and it would add 1.2m to the roof height.

Location

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached residential property, which is located on the north west side of Turners Meadow Way. The property is located within a cul-de-sac and the surrounding area is residential in character. There is an existing side garage, with space to the front for off-street parking. The property is located in Flood Zone 2.

Consultations

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

- Not been informed of planning application
- There is a right of way next to the proposed development, which provides access to the rear of neighbouring properties
- The proposed roof hip is higher than the existing garage. Resulting in overshadowing of the rear gardens

- Access path adjacent is only 1m wider.
- Not in accordance with Council's Policy H9 which requires 1m side space
- Development would infill the much of the space between the buildings
- Loss of light
- Reduce enjoyment to neighbouring properties
- Extension should not encroach onto the access path
- Construction of extension should also not obstruct path
- Building in front of the garage would not leave enough space for one car.
- Restrictions on car parking within the street and any visiting car would need a parking permit
- Concerns with the foundations and need for a party wall agreement
- The application is described as single storey but the apex of the roof would be higher than the eaves of the house, meaning this is really a two-storey side extension
- Height would create a 'canyoning' effect
- The degree of cramping does not occur elsewhere in Turners Meadow and the proposal does not protect the spatial standards of the area
- Additional height would feel oppressive from the back garden of No 32
- Would only be 1m away from a landing window, which would reduce enjoyment of the property for current and future occupiers
- Garage was previously converted and is only used for storage. It would be more sensible to return the garage to its original purpose of storing a car
- There would not be enough space to park a car in the front of the extension
- There are parking restrictions on Turners Meadow so any second car or visitors would need a parking permit. Future occupiers may have two cars.
- Queries about the need for an additional wet room
- The grant of planning permission for the estate application number 86.1576 dated 6 August 1986 contains conditions regarding retention of parking spaces and appropriate spaces in front of garages should also be retained. The proposal would be in breach of these conditions which in the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety
- A copy of the original decision has been included.
- Subsidence Concerns about the load bearing capacity of the garage.

A set of annotated photos have been included with an objection and these are available on the file for Members to view.

Highways - The development will result in loss of one parking space by conversion of the garage to a habitable accommodation. Furthermore the applicant reduced the area in front of the garage by 2.0m.

Two cars should be able to park within the area in front of the garage; therefore the minimum depth of 9.0m is required.

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

SPG 1 General Design Principles
SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance

84/01061/LBB - Beckenham Baths Library Site and Land R/O 20-28 BR3 4PF
Four Squash Courts, Sports Hall, All Weather Outdoor Floodlit Area, Ancillary
Accommodation as Extension of Existing Baths Complex, New Car Park, Public
Garden, Public Halls, Public Toilets with Residential Development Playing Fields
On Land At Rear (Outline) Permission 27.11.1984

86/00981/LBB - Beckenham Baths And Library Site And Land Rear Of BR3 4PF
Construction of Sports Hall and Ancillary Accommodation as Extension to Existing
Baths Complex, Laying Out of Playing Field, New Car Park, Public Garden, Public
Halls, Public Toilets with Residential Development on Land at Rear (Outline)
Permission 03.07.1986

86/01576/FUL - Land Rear Of 20-28 Beckenham Road Beckenham BR3 4PF
Residential Development Comprising 113 Houses/Flats Permission 31.07.1986

The following relevant conditions were attached to the above permission:

- (4) Before commencement of the use of the land or buildings 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 development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning General Development Orders 1977-81 or not shall be carried out on the land of the garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.

Reason: Development without adequate parking or garage provision is likely to lead to parking inconvenience to other road users and to be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to safety.

- (47) Parking bays shall measure 2.4m x 5m and there shall be a clear space of 6m in front of each space (or 7.5m if garages are provided) to allow for manoeuvring and these spaces shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the Director of Technical Services.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

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.

Policy H9 requires proposals of two or more storeys in height to be a minimum of 1m from the side boundary. However, H9(ii) states that 'where higher standards of separation already exist in residential areas, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space'. Para 4.48 explains that the Council consider it important to 'prevent a cramped appearance and is necessary to protect the high spatial standards and visual amenity which characterise many of the Borough's residential areas'.

Policy H8 states that the design and layout of proposals for the alteration or enlargement of a property should respect and complement the scale, form of the host dwelling and be compatible development in the surrounding area. Space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where they contribute to the character of the area.

The proposal would see the alteration and extension of an existing single-storey garage, which is located to the side of the property. This is currently set back from the front elevation and includes a pitched roof. The surrounding area comprises similar two-storey residential dwellings, with single-storey side garages. The street has a cul-de-sac arrangement and the property is located close to the head of the road. The host dwelling forms one half of a semi-detached pair, which are set back from the front building line of No 32. When entering Turners Meadow, the property is therefore seen against the backdrop of the neighbouring flank elevation, which projects forward due to its proximity with the head of the cul-de-sac. In terms of its spatial character, this section of Turners Meadow includes buildings which are set closer together and at present, when travelling in a northerly direction, the garage is completely obscured by the bulk of the host dwelling and narrow spacing between the buildings. The existing garage is visible when looking at the property directly; however when standing at the head of the cul-de-sac the forward projection of No 32 also partially obscures the flank elevation of No 31.

The extension would be located to the front of the existing garage and would measure 2.7m in depth, this would still however include a 1.6m set back from the front elevation. The alterations would also see the extension to the roof, which would raise the height of the existing garage by 1.2m. This would retain a pitched design, which is similar to the existing arrangement. The submitted plans indicate that this additional height would allow for the provision of storage within the roof and the maximum height of the garage would now be higher than the eaves of the main dwelling. The overall appearance is therefore more than single-storey and would fail to comply with the provisions of policy H9. However, there is access path located to the north of the garage, which serves the rear of neighbouring properties to the north.

The building itself would not any wider than the existing garage and would not encroach onto this access path. There is also already an established mass in this location. The bulk of neighbouring properties and arrangement of the buildings would still screen the extension when travelling in a northerly direction and this arrangement, together with its set-back from the front elevation would also ensure that the development would not appear overly prominent within the streetscene.

The additional height and forward projection would add to the bulk to the garage, however in terms of its spatial relationship with neighbouring properties and the area in general, it is considered that the extension would still appear sufficiently subservient in this context and the access path would prevent the appearance of terracing thereby protecting the spatial characteristics of the streetscene.

Subject to the use of matching materials, which could be controlled by way of a condition, Members may consider that the proposed extension would be an acceptable alteration, which would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or area in general.

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 proposed extension would be located adjacent to the flank elevation of No 32 Turners Meadow Way. This property is located to the north of the application site and is also set forward of the host dwelling. There is one window located within the flank elevation of this neighbouring dwelling and this appears to serve a stairwell/landing window. The existing garage does however currently project beyond the rear building line of No 32. There is also an access path located between the side elevation of the existing garage and the flank elevation of No 32. This path appears to serve the neighbouring properties to the north of the site and according to the representations which have been received; these neighbours have a right of way and access.

The proposed extension would be to the front of the existing garage and additional height would add bulk to the existing built form. However, this bulk would be primarily located against the flank elevation of No 32. The additional roof height would be visible from the rear gardens of No 32 and 33 Turners Meadow, however the existing built form of the garage and bulk of No 31 has already resulted in some visual incursion to these rear gardens. The extension would be located approximately 1.3m from the common side boundary with No 32 and whilst the orientation of the site may result in some additional overshadowing to these rear gardens, when taking into account the existing building arrangement, this harm is not considered to be of material degree that could sustain a refusal. The built form would also result in some additional overshadowing on the neighbouring flank window at No 32, however this window appears to serve a stairwell/landing and not a habitable room. There is also already an established level of overshadowing from the bulk of the host dwelling in this location. The impact on this neighbouring window and the light it receives is therefore considered to be on balance acceptable.

Visually, the primary bulk of the extension would be screened by the flank elevation of the host dwelling and neighbouring side elevation. As noted above, the additional height and roof would be visible from neighbouring gardens; however it would be setback from the common side boundary with No 32 by 1.3m and there is

an even greater setback between the development and No 33. The additional height is not therefore considered to be significantly oppressive or visual dominant when taking into account the existing building arrangement and setback. Concerns have been raised about the visual impact for neighbours who are using the access path. This is however an access path and movements in this space are transient. Whilst the extension may make this space more enclosed, this is not considered to be significantly harmful given its use.

In relation to overlooking and privacy the proposal would incorporate windows within the rear facing roof slope and side elevation of the existing garage, which would face the applicant's garden. The fenestration arrangement would not result in overlooking or a loss of privacy which exceeds the current situation.

Other Matters

The proposal would result in the loss of an existing garage. Concerns have been raised by neighbouring residents about the loss of the parking space and subsequent impact on street parking pressures. The highways officer has stated that space for two cars should be provided. However, a space of approximately 6m would be still be available in front of the proposed extension. Further, at the time of the site visit there was on-street parking spaces available. There are parking restrictions in place, including residents parking between the hours of 10am-12pm. The site has a moderate PTAL of 3 and is within walking distance of a number of bus routes and a railway station. On balance, it is considered that the impact on parking would be acceptable.

The property is located within flood zone 2. The proposed development is considered to be 'minor development' and is therefore covered by the Environment Agency's standing advice.

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.