

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

Application No : 16/04784/FULL6

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 55 Kechill Gardens Hayes Bromley BR2
7NB

OS Grid Ref: E: 540392 N: 167133

Applicant : Mr M Ross

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey front/side/rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
River Centre Line
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

The application property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey garage and gardens to the side of the property.

The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached bungalows and two storey dwellings. There are generous spaces between dwellings, combined with the set back of house behind garden frontages and/or driveways, which contribute to the character and appearance of the street scene.

The host dwelling lies to the south of the bungalow at No. 57 and projects forwards of that dwelling towards the road, as a consequence of the turning head siting of the semi-detached bungalows. To the south lies the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No. 53 which lies within a wider plot with a width of approx. 18, compared with the 15m plot width of the host property.

It is proposed to erect a substantial two storey side extension to the dwelling. The extension would have a width of 2.7m (the host dwelling has a width of approx. 6.6m). The extension would have a pitched roof with a ridgeline subservient to the main ridgeline of the existing dwelling and which would incorporate a hipped flank roofslope. The first floor front elevation would be set back from the main adjacent front elevation by approx. 1.1m, with the ground floor front elevation being a continuation of the existing single storey porch/bay window feature.

The extension would include an integral garage which would replace the existing detached garage. The garage would incorporate a modest pitched roof which

would continue for almost the full width of the extended dwelling. A side space of 3m would be retained to the northern flank boundary.

At the rear, a part one/two storey extension would project by approx. 3.2m to the rear. The two storey element would be set approx. 8.5m from the party boundary with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No. 53, would align with the outer flank elevation of the extended dwelling and would be approx. 3.75m wide.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

No objections were raised from a technical highways perspective to the previous scheme. Conditions were recommended with regards to car and cycle parking, the provision of a hardstanding for wash down facilities and highway drainage, along with an informative to draw attention to the applicant bearing the cost of any alterations to street furniture.

Planning Considerations

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

Unitary Development Plan

Policy BE1	Design of New Development
Policy H8	Residential Extensions
Policy H9	Side space
Policy T3	Parking

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closes on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that an updated Local Development Scheme will be submitted to Development Control Committee on November 24th 2016 and Executive Committee on November 30th 2016, indicating the submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State in the early part of 2017.

Policies in the draft Local Plan of relevance to the determination of this application are:

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions
Draft Policy 8 Side Space
Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development
Draft Policy 30 Parking

London Plan

Policy 7.4 Local Character

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Para. 56 of the NPPF states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and indivisible from good planning. Para. 58 states that planning decisions should respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials

Planning History

Planning permission was refused under reference 15/04204 for a scheme which provided 1.15m side space to the northern flank boundary and had a width of 7.45m, exceeding that of the host dwelling.

Permission was refused on the grounds:

The proposal, by reason of its excessive width, bulk and siting in relation to the boundary, would have a cramped and overdominant appearance, out of character with and detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling, the visual amenities of the street scene and the distinctive residential character of the area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Under reference 15/05501 planning permission was refused for a reduced scheme which provided a side space of 2.15m to the northern flank boundary and which was 6.45m wide, broadly commensurate with the width of the host dwelling. Permission was refused on the grounds:

The proposal, by reason of its excessive width, bulk and siting, would have a cramped and overdominant appearance, out of character with and detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling, the visual amenities of the street scene and the distinctive residential character of the area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

A subsequent appeal against the refusal of planning permission was dismissed. The Inspector noted the main issue as being the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and concluded:

"Notwithstanding the other extensions in the area I consider that the proposal before me is of a width and bulk that detracts from the character and appearance of the existing house. Also, while just over 2 metres would remain between the house and the side boundary, the proposal would still substantially reduce the existing site space."

The Inspector considered that the extensions would have been disproportionate to the existing dwelling, being large and bulky and accordingly harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

The application dwelling is semi-detached, and the adjoining dwelling at No. 53 has an extensive planning history. While each case is considered on its merits, the

planning history of the adjacent property is relevant to an assessment of the proposal in that the implementation of permission granted for a similar extension at the adjoining dwelling would impact visually on the semi-detached pair of dwellings when viewed together.

The adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No. 53 has been the subject of a number of applications following the grant of planning permission for a substantial two storey side extension which replaced an unattractive and substantially wide flat roofed extension. Following the grant of planning permission for the replacement/enlarged two storey side extension under reference 12/02589, subsequent applications have sought the development of the side of the house to provide a self-contained dwellinghouse. Most recently, planning permission was granted for a part one/two storey side extension at the neighbouring property under reference 15/03041 and subsequently an appeal against the Council's refusal of planning permission to sever the extension from the host dwelling to form a self-contained dwelling was allowed (ref. 16/01129).

The permitted extension at No. 53 has a width of 7.45m, but due to the width of that plot, a side space of 4.05m is shown to be retained at the front of the extension, reducing to 3.7m at the rear. The built form and scale of the extension at No.53 is shown to be commensurate with that currently proposed, albeit within a wider plot. The permission has not, to date, been implemented.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area. It is noted that in refusing planning permission under reference 15/05501 the reason for refusal referred specifically to the impact on visual amenity and neither the Council nor the Inspector considered the impact of the previous application proposals on residential amenity to be unacceptable.

The proposed extension seeks to overcome the concerns previously expressed regarding the disproportionate scale and bulk of the extension and the erosion of side space to the northern boundary. To this end, the proposed extension would be narrower than the host dwelling, incorporates a first floor set back from the adjacent first floor front elevation and a lower ridgeline than the main host roof. Further, the rear extension would have a less convoluted roof design and the overall bulk and scale of the extension would be less dominant. A side space of 3m would be provided to the flank boundary rather than the 2.15m previously proposed.

While the extension would still be large, it is considered that the cumulative amendments to the scheme have improved the relationship between the extension and the host dwelling, with the reduced width and first floor and roof scale and appearance in particular providing a degree of subservience which was lacking in the previous proposal.

The proposed extension would be similar (albeit narrower and with increased subservience) to that which has been granted planning permission at No. 53 (the adjoining semi-detached dwelling). In this respect, the application proposal would

balance the pair of dwellings, if the permission granted in respect of No. 53 was to be implemented. The planning permission for substantial flank/rear extensions at No. 53 was granted in the light of the since demolished large and obtrusive two storey flat roofed extension, taking into account the width of the plot and the extent to which substantial side space could be retained. Subsequently, permission has been granted on appeal for the implementation of that development as a self-contained residential unit rather than an extension to the host dwelling.

The side space retained in the case of the extension granted planning permission at No. 53 was 4m. The side space to be retained in this current application would be 3m. In view of the difference in the plot widths of each of the original semi-detached dwellings along with the differing width of development proposed, it is considered that the current scheme would more readily retain an impression of spaciousness in the context of the site and surroundings than the previous scheme.

Summary

On balance, it is considered that the current scheme adequately addresses the concerns expressed by the appeal Inspector regarding the disproportionate appearance, size and bulk of the previous proposals. The increase in side space allied with the associated reduction in the width and scale of the extension would result in a development that is more subservient and proportionate to the host and adjoining dwelling as well as the character and appearance 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 northern elevation of the extensions hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interest of the residential amenities of the area and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 5** 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 permanently retained as such thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Appendix II of the Unitary Development Plan and to the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety.

- 6** Surface water from private land shall not discharge on to the highway. Details of the drainage system for surface water drainage to prevent the discharge of surface water from private land on to the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works. Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the drainage system shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained permanently thereafter.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory means of surface water drainage.

- 7** While the development hereby permitted is being carried out a suitable hardstanding shall be provided with wash-down facilities for cleaning the wheels of vehicles and any accidental accumulation of mud of the highway caused by such vehicles shall be removed without delay and in no circumstances be left behind at the end of the working day.

Reason: In the interest of pedestrian and vehicular safety and in order to comply with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

You are further informed that:

- 1** You are advised that this application may be liable for the payment of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the Planning Act 2008. The London Borough of Bromley is the Collecting Authority for the Mayor and this Levy is payable on the commencement of

development (defined in Part 2, para 7 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010). It is the responsibility of the owner and /or person(s) who have a material interest in the relevant land to pay the Levy (defined under Part 2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010). If you fail to follow the payment procedure, the collecting authority may impose surcharges on this liability, take enforcement action, serve a stop notice to prohibit further development on the site and/or take action to recover the debt. Further information about Community Infrastructure Levy can be found on attached information note and the Bromley website www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL

- 2 Any repositioning, alteration and or/adjustment to street furniture or Statutory Undertaker's apparatus considered necessary and practical to help with the modification of the vehicular crossover shall be undertaken at the cost of the applicant.**