

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 16/03424/FULL6

Ward:
West Wickham

Address : 15 The Drive, West Wickham BR4 0EP

OS Grid Ref: E: 538622 N: 166572

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Paul Brinkley

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Roof extensions incorporating dormer windows to front and rear and rooflights to all elevations and part one/two storey side, single storey front, first floor side and rear extensions and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 2

Proposal

The application proposes to extend at both the ground floor and first floor, convert the garage and alter the roof to create habitable accommodation in the roofspace.

This is a resubmission of a previously refused application (ref:15/05117/FULL6) that was also dismissed at appeal. The amendments include the retention of the existing double gable and an increase of the window above the entrance to be aligned with the opening below. There is also a reduction of the height of the projecting rear gable.

The application site hosts a two storey detached dwelling on the northern side of The Drive, West Wickham. The surrounding area is characterised by traditional family dwelling, set within large mature landscaped plots. The property has a prominent front gable feature.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and one letter of representation has been received which can be summarised as follows;

- The front facing roof dormer window and roof light is out of character
- A front facing dormer was refused at No.,6A and a consistent policy should be adopted

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space

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

SPG No1 - General Design Principles
SPG No2 - Residential Design Guidance

Planning History

Under planning reference 15/03588 the application was refused permission for roof extensions incorporating dormer windows to front and rear and rooflights to all elevations and part one/two storey side, single storey front, first floor side and rear extensions and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation

Planning permission was refused on 4th January 2016 (ref: 15/05117/FULL6) for roof extensions incorporating dormer windows to front and rear and rooflights to all elevations and part one/two storey side, single storey front, first floor side and rear extensions and conversion of garage to habitable accommodation

It was refused for the following reasons:

The extensions in the manner proposed would create a bulky and over dominant form of development, which would be harmful to neighbouring amenity and the character of the area, contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006)

The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirement for a minimum 1 metre side space to be maintained to the flank boundary in respect of two-storey development in the absence of which the extension would constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene, contrary to Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

The application was also dismissed at appeal.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area, the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties and whether it has overcome the previous dismissed appeal decision.

Design

The previous appeal decision APP/G5180/D/16/3146248 states that the 'front and rear gable projections would be increased in height, which would increase their prominence within the street scene and the rear garden environment. Within the street scene the height of the building would be emphasised by the spacious setting of the site and more modest height of the adjacent dwellings. Although the smaller gable feature would reflect that of the original dwelling the proposed tall glazing panels to the west of it would increase the perceived height of the gable. At the same time the ground and first floor elements of this glazing would be out of alignment with each other and the first floor element would detract from the otherwise balanced appearance of the double gable'.

The Inspector therefore felt that the front double gable would appear unduly large, awkward and unbalanced, and it would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the general street scene. This revised application now retains the existing double gable of the host property. Whilst the windows have been increased above the entrance they now align with the opening below, rather than the extent of glazing which was previously proposed that increased the prominence of the property. There is no uniformity of architectural style along this road, however the reduced bulk and mass of the roof extensions are now considered to be acceptable on balance and would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and general street scene.

The previous application was also refused as it did not comply with a minimum 1 m space between the flank wall and the boundary, in accordance with Policy H9, as there was an existing ground floor extension within 0.3m of the boundary. On this point, the Inspector felt that the existing ground floor extension was modest in height and the proposed first floor side extensions were both setback from and materially lower than the main gable front projections. Given that the site is wider than adjacent plots, the Inspector felt that the first floor extensions would be particularly spacious in the street scene, and as a consequence, the overall scheme would comply with the objectives of Policy H9 of the UDP and thus the conflict with this policy would not on its own, amount to a reason for dismissing the appeal.

The side extensions remain in the same position and are of the same footprint as the previous proposal. Given the Inspector's decision is a material consideration to this appeal, where the Inspector felt the side extensions would comply with objectives of Policy H9, the Council does not object to this element of the proposal.

Residential Amenity and Impact on Adjoining Properties

In regards to the impact upon neighbouring properties, the Inspector felt that whilst the resultant dwelling would project beyond the first floor rear elevations of 13 and 17 The Drive, it would not have a material impact on the main outlook from the dwellings at Nos 13 and 17. Whilst the Inspector acknowledged that the upper floors of the proposed rear gable projection would be visually prominent and the large areas of glazing could result in actual and perceived loss of privacy, she felt that the 'resultant dwelling would not be visually overbearing and any actual or

perceived loss of privacy would not be uncommon in an area that is characterised by uniformly sited two storey dwellings'.

Therefore given that the side and rear extensions will remain the same footprint as previously considered by the inspector and combined with the reduction in the size of the roof extension, it is not considered that there would a detrimental overbearing impact upon the neighbouring properties.

The principle of converting the garage to habitable accommodation is considered acceptable due to a large driveway at the front of the dwelling and on-street parking available.

Having had regard to the above, members may wish to consider in light of the previous appeal decision and the reduction in the bulk and mass of the roof extensions, the development in the manner proposed is considered acceptable on balance, in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents and impact negatively 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.

- 4 No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the side elevation(s) of the**

extension hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.