

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 16/03376/FULL6

Ward:
Biggin Hill

Address : 34 Allenby Road Biggin Hill TN16 3LH

OS Grid Ref: E: 542212 N: 158774

Applicant : Mr B Murrell

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

First floor extension to create a two storey dwelling and single storey front and rear extensions

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 24

Proposal

Permission is sought for the addition of a first floor to the existing dwelling, and single storey front and rear extensions. The first floor would have a depth of 8.25m, extend the width of the dwelling and would be set back 1m from the front of the property. The single storey rear extension would have a depth of 4m, and the front extension would have a depth of 2.05m to infill the existing step in the property.

Location

The application site currently hosts a single storey detached dwelling location on the eastern side of Allenby Road close to the junction with Haig Road. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it Listed.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

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

- A sun study should be submitted to fully assess impact on amenity.
- Confirmation of accurate eaves soffit height in relation to No.36 should be shown.
- Section showing relative heights / levels between properties should be provided.
- More sensible plan than previous submissions but would require above details.
- Concerns it could be out of keeping with the street.

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

Planning History

The property has been the subject of the previous applications;

- 15/05655/FULL6 - Roof alterations for the addition of first floor, two storey rear extension, single storey front extension and elevational alterations - Refused 23.02.2016
- 16/01370/FULL6 - First floor extension to create a two storey dwelling and single storey front and rear extensions - Refused 13.05.16

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 application site was visited by the case officer and 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.

The application was recently the subject of a similar application (Ref:15/05655) which sought permission for the addition of first floor, two storey rear extension, single storey front extension and elevational alterations. The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal by way of its excessive bulk, height and rearward projection, would result in an over dominant and incongruous addition to the host dwelling, harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the streetscene contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposal by way of its excessive depth and height would have a detrimental effect on the amenities of the adjoining dwellings by reason of loss of light, privacy and visual impact, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. 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, 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.

A further application was then submitted which attempted to overcome the previous concerns. The application ref 16/01370 was refused on the grounds that:

1. The proposal by way of its excessive depth would have a detrimental effect on the amenities of the adjoining dwellings by reason of loss of light and visual impact, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

No objection was raised to the single storey front and rear extensions within the previous application. Given that these elements would remain the same size as the previous application the single storey front and rear extensions are considered acceptable additions to the host dwelling.

The current application seeks to overcome these previous refusal reasons by reducing the rearward projection of the proposed first floor element by 1m. The forward projection of the first floor addition has also increased by 1.05m. The height of the first floor addition would remain the same as the previous application.

The proposed first floor addition would have a depth of 8.25m and would extend the width of the dwelling. It would be set back 1m from the front of the property, and would not project beyond the rear of the existing single storey dwelling. The proposed roof would be hipped, and the ridge height would increase by 1.7m to 7.5m, with an eaves height of 5.7m.

The revised application has increased the depth of the proposed first floor from 8.2 to 8.25m, however it has set it further forward so that its rearward projection has reduced by 1m.

No concerns were raised within the previous application over the impact on No.32 given it would not project beyond the rear of No.32 and no concerns are raised within this application over its rearward projection to this neighbour. The extension would however project 1.05m further forward than the previous application, and it would extend beyond the front of the neighbouring property. However, given its orientation it would not impact significant on light to the front of this neighbour, and any impact on outlook would not be sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application.

With regards to No.36 the previous application projected beyond the 45 degree line when established from the middle of the first floor rear dormer window of No.36, and it was therefore considered that the proposal was excessive in depth and would result in the loss of outlook and light to the neighbour at No.36, particularly given the orientation of the sites. Given that the current application has reduced this rearward projection by 1m the proposal would not protrude beyond the established 45 degree. Whilst the impact on outlook No.36 has been lessened by reducing the rearwards projection, the extension has been moved forwards and the depth and bulk of the proposed extension have remained similar. Therefore the current proposal is not considered to have fully overcome the previous concerns

and would still result in an unacceptable level of harm by reason of loss of light and visual impact to the neighbouring property.

It is noted that the only window in the flank elevations would serve the landing and therefore the current proposal would not result in any significant loss of privacy to the adjoining neighbours.

The existing street scene is characterised by single storey bungalows or chalets, with some featuring loft conversions and front dormers such as the neighbouring property. There are also a number of two storey dwellings located within close proximity, including directly opposite the application site. The proposed front extension and porch are not considered to have a significant impact on the streetscene, whilst the rear extension would not be visible. No concerns were raised within the previous application in respect of the increase in the ridge height which would be similar to other examples of two storey dwellings in the area, or the design of the roof, which has been hipped to pitch away from the front of the property. The previous application set the first floor back 2.05m from the front of the property and whilst the current application would only be set back 1m from the front of the property it is not considered to result in a detrimental impact to the streetscene

Having had regard to the above, it was considered that the development would not overcome the previous refusal grounds and would result in a loss of amenity to local residents.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposal by way of its excessive depth would have a detrimental effect on the amenities of the adjoining dwelling at No.36 by reason of loss of light and visual impact, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.**