

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

**Application No :** 16/03358/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Plaistow And Sundridge**

**Address :** 6 Lawn Close Bromley BR1 3NA

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 540708 N: 170490

**Applicant :** Mr Raymond Duncan

**Objections : YES**

### **Description of Development:**

Single storey front and rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Smoke Control SCA 7

### **Proposal**

The site is a detached two storey dwelling house located on the west side of the Lawn Close cul-de-sac. A railway line runs to the rear of the site and the site, at its southern tip, lies adjacent to Garden Road Conservation Area. This application proposes single storey front and rear extensions.

### **Consultations**

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

- \* Out of character and spoil openness of the Close
- \* Over-development - Already been extended to the maximum
- \* Set a precedent
- \* Width and depth of extension would be out of proportion and detrimental to the pleasant appearance of the Close
- \* Seems the same to that previously refused
- \* No objection to the rear extension
- \* Impact on the amenity of sitting room, the window of which is at right angles to the proposed development
- \* Site plan is incorrect - closer to No 7 than shown

### **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

### London Plan Policy 7.4

The planning history includes permission reference 02/02500 for two storey side and rear extension and canopy to front elevation and more recently planning application reference 16/01247, single storey front and rear extensions, roof alterations to form habitable accommodation incorporating rear dormer, was refused for the following reasons:

*The proposed development by reason of its size, siting, design, the context within which it sits and relationship to the adjacent dwelling at No 7 would result in a cramped, overbearing form of development harmful to neighbouring amenity, the appearance of the host dwelling and to the street scene generally, contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.*

*The proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site and be out of scale and form of adjacent buildings detrimental to the host dwelling, the street scene and character of the area thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.*

This application, 16/01247, is currently the subject of an appeal the decision of which is still awaited.

A previous application, reference 15/05295, was also refused permission for single storey front and rear extensions, Roof alterations to form habitable room incorporating rear dormer and elevational alterations. It was refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development by reason of its size, siting, design, the context within which it sits and relationship to the adjacent dwelling at No 7 would result in a cramped, overbearing form of development harmful to neighbouring amenity, the appearance of the host dwelling and to the street scene generally, contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

The proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site and be out of scale and form of adjacent buildings detrimental to the host dwelling, the street scene and character of the area thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

## **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 and whether the current scheme addresses previous grounds of refusal.

As noted in the previous report "Lawn Close is a development of 12 detached houses set in a square, around a circular road layout. There are a variety of house designs within the development. There is generally a feeling of openness to the Close and although there are differing house designs there appear to be certain characteristics along with the absence of front garden fencing which bring a distinct and coherent character to the Close.

The host dwelling has been extended with a two storey side and rear extension and porch to the front elevation. The 'corner' siting of No 6 to the far side of the Close and the size of the house as extended result in No 6 being a prominent house within the Close, appearing visually to stretch virtually the site frontage".

In relation to the proposed front element the previous report noted, "... Whilst the revisions and reductions are noted from that previously proposed, it remains that a forward extension in this location will add a form of development that is incompatible with the layout of adjacent buildings and produces an alien and incongruous form of development within the street scene, detracting from the openness and character of the Close".

This proposal is reduced from the previous application in that the raised ridge and rear dormer are deleted from the scheme. A number of local objections have been received raising concern with the impact on the character of the Close and over-development of the site. As mentioned, the dwelling has been previously extended and has a prominent bearing within the Close. Therefore, whilst on its own the front extension may not give rise to such planning concern in respect of its impact on the character of the area, it is the cumulative impact and whether the additional front element gives rise to overdevelopment of the site and causes such harm to the visual amenities of the area as to continue to raise planning concern. It is considered that, on balance, the front extension, on its own, may not form such an unacceptable form of development as to continue to raise planning concern.

Neighbour concern is also raised in respect of the impact of the front extension on the amenity of the sitting room, the window of which is at right angles to the proposed development. The previous report noted: "...The neighbouring window is to the north north-west of the proposed development and although unlikely to have such a significant impact in respect of light (there are two large windows which serve this sitting room) the relationship of the development to the amenity of this room will remain to have some impact on the prospect, however may now not create such a sense of enclosure as with the previous design....".

The single storey extension to the rear will not impact on neighbouring amenity and no planning objection is raised to this element of the proposal.

Members will note, as stated previously in the report, that there is an outstanding appeal decision in respect of the previous planning refusal.

Having had regard to the above Members may consider that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in such a significant

loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area such to raise planning grounds of refusal.

**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.**