

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

Application No : 16/03547/FULL6

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : 1 Grangewood Lane Beckenham BR3
1NT

OS Grid Ref: E: 536796 N: 170600

Applicant : Mr Edward Laughlin

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey side/rear/front extension, alterations to roof, rooflights and solar panels

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a part one/two storey side/rear extension, front porch, roof alterations and rooflights

This a revised planning application for a previously refused application for a similar development 15/02546ful that was dismissed on appeal, ref: APP/G5180/D/15/3137262. The merits of the proposed revisions in order to overcome the previous reasons for refusal are discussed in the assessment section below.

Location

The site is located on the south side of Grangewood Lane and comprises a two storey post war detached dwelling house. The original building has been extended to the western flank boundary with a two storey side extension incorporating an integral garage. To the front a small single storey front extension has been added towards the eastern end of the front elevation abutting the boundary to 'Southcroft' on Grangewood Lane. The footprint of the existing dwellinghouse is set approximately 2m rearward of No2 Grangewood lane and approximately level with 'Southcroft'.

Grangewood Lane is a private unmade access road only, leading to Copers Cope Road.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and one letter of objection was received which can be summarised as follows:

- The property deeds show that the property only has a right to pass and repass along Grangewood Lane. This legally doesn't give the applicant a right to park on the lane. Under these deeds they are required to contain all parking within the red line of the boundary. The owners do not confine to this now and if this proposed development is allowed there it will reduce the area further.
- The owners will not have sufficient space to turn a vehicle around and will have to reverse back up the lane on to a main highway.
- Parking standards show that parking space should be 5m by 2.4m and the plans show the space in front of the property is only 4.7m by 2.3m.
- The garage does not comply with a width of 2.6m
- The refusal in relation to side space separation has not been addressed, especially due to the height and discontinuous nature of the proposed wall.

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
T3 Parking
T18 Road Safety

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

Planning permission was refused in March 2015 for a part one/two storey side/rear extension, front porch, roof alterations and rooflights ref: 14/04956/FULL6 for the following reasons:

The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirement for a high standard of side space separation 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, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed and contrary to Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed external rear first floor terrace would facilitate direct overlooking of neighbouring property and increased elevated noise and disturbance with a resultant adverse effect on the privacy and residential amenity of adjoining and nearby occupiers contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Planning permission was refused in August 2015 for a part one/two storey side/rear extension, front porch, roof alterations and rooflight ref 15/02546/FULL6 for the following reasons:

The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirements for a high standard of side space separation to be maintained to the flank boundary in respect of two storey development in the absence of which the extensions would constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed and contrary to Policy H9 of the Unitary development Plan.

The proposed obscure glazed screens on the side elevations of the balcony at first floor level, by reason of their height, depth and design would add bulk and mass to both side elevations, which would be overbearing and detrimental to the outlook of both neighbouring properties, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed wall along the common boundary with No.2 Grangewood Lane, by reason of its height and depth would be overbearing and detrimental to the outlook of the occupiers of No.2, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

This was also dismissed on appeal ref APP/G5180/D/15/3137262

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.

The aims and objectives of the above policies, national and regional planning guidance, all other material planning considerations including any objections, other representations and relevant planning history on the site were taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

As stated in the previous applications, the overall design approach of the scheme is considered to be acceptable. The host building is a post-war dwelling and is non-descript in its appearance. The intended design takes a contemporary approach. This approach is supported within this context and there are many good examples of modern architecture within the Borough that follow this principle.

Whilst the previous two applications were refused due to their excessive bulk and non compliance with Policy H9, the Inspector's decision states the following in relation to this element

'The main part of the house is around two metres from the east boundary but there is a flat roofed ground floor extension at the front of the property which abuts the boundary. The side extension would abut the east boundary at ground floor level and would retain a gap of one metre at first floor level. Due to the maintenance of this gap at first floor level and the fact that part of the building already abuts the boundary at ground floor level, it is not considered that the side extension would lead to the dwelling appearing cramped on this plot'

The Inspector goes on further to say ' I acknowledge Policy H9 of the Unitary Development plan (UDP) states two storey extensions should maintain a gap of one metre from the side boundary for the full height of the extension. However for the reasons given, I do not consider the side extension would lead to a cramped appearance or have any adverse impact on the appearance of the area. As such, despite breaching the technical standards in Policy H9 of the UDP, this part of the proposal would accord with the principle of Policy H9'.

This element of the proposal remains the same in this application and in view of the Inspector's decision, it is therefore considered to be acceptable.

The previous application also proposed glazing along the balcony to mitigate overlooking to the neighbouring properties. The Inspector considered that the modern design would contrast with the traditional character of the host dwelling and would appear incongruous. He stated that whilst they would be located to the rear of the property, they would be visible from neighbouring properties and their incongruity would harm the character and appearance of the area.

A Juliet balcony is now proposed at first floor level to overcome this issue and a condition preventing the flat roof being used as a balcony could be attached if planning permission were granted.

Residential Amenity and Impact on Adjoining Properties

In terms of residential amenity it is considered that there would be no significant impact on the privacy and amenity of the adjoining property 'Southcroft; to the east, in terms of loss of light and outlook, given the setback of this property from the common boundary. The wall along the common boundary with 'Southcroft' will be no deeper or higher than the previous application. The previous application was not refused on the grounds of loss of sunlight/daylight to this property.

The previous application did however propose a 2.5m deep wall to extend beyond the rear line of the extension along the common boundary with No.2 to improve privacy. At a height of 3m, this wall would have extended approximately 5.2m beyond the rear line of No.2s extension and given its height and depth along the boundary it was considered to be overbearing and detrimental to the outlook from No.2. The Inspector agreed that due to the height and depth of the boundary wall, it would appear overbearing and would adversely affect the outlook from No.2.

The boundary wall has therefore been removed from this application and the proposal is not considered to cause any adverse amenity impacts upon the neighbouring properties and complies with Policies H8 and BE1 of the UDP.

Highways and Traffic Issues

The objection letter refers to the substandard size of the parking space and highway impact. The previous application was not refused on these grounds and no change is proposed to this element of the proposal. Highways officers previously commented that the property has a limited depth drive at 4.025m to the front which provides a substandard off-street parking space. This will remain unaltered and similarly the existing garage space will be maintained. It is regrettable that improved provision is not proposed. However, given there is no change as such it is considered that the proposal would not have any increased effect on highway safety and the proposal would not cause increased on street parking. The proposal would maintain off road parking at the site.

Other matters

Ownership of land and deeds of a property are civil matters and therefore are not considered relevant to the assessment of a planning application .

Summary

Having had regard to the above and in light of the recent appeal decision, Members may consider that the siting, size and design of the proposed extension 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 existing building and locality.

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 The flat roof area of shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area and there shall be no access to the roof area.

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

5 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 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.