

## **Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS**

**Application No :** 16/05424/FULL6

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

**Address :** 73 Hillcrest Road Bromley BR1 4SA

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 540223 N: 171587

**Applicant :** Mr Marcus Rutherford

**Objections : NO**

### **Description of Development:**

Demolition of existing garage to side and erection two storey side and rear extension with accommodation within the roofspace.

### **Key designations:**

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

### **Proposal**

The application seeks permission for the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a two storey side and rear extension, with accommodation within the roofspace.

The two storey side extension would have a maximum width of 5.3m and depth of 9.1m. The property is located on a triangular shaped plot and as such the extension is set back from the front elevation by 1.786m and increases in width from 3.819m to 5.3m at the rear of the site to follow the boundary. The extension will project 3.5m beyond the original rear elevation (1.2m beyond the existing single storey rear extension).

The roof would be gabled and would provide a continuation of the existing ridge height at 7.2m high for a further 6m in width, before stepping down in height to 6m for a width of 1.25m. The roof also includes a dormer in the rear roofslope with a width of 3.9m and depth of 3.5m.

### **Location**

The application site hosts a two storey end of terrace property located on Hillcrest Road. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it Listed.

### **Consultations**

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

Highways Officers raised no objection to the proposal.

## **Planning Considerations**

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

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012):

The NPPF confirms that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### London Plan (2016):

7.4 Local Character

7.6 Architecture

### Unitary Development Plan 2006

BE1 Design of New Development

H8 Residential Extensions

H9 Side Space

### Draft Local Plan 2016

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 closed on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State will occur in the early part of 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions

Draft Policy 8 Side Space

Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

## **Planning History**

The application site has no previous planning history.

## **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.

## Design

London Plan Policy 7.4 requires developments to have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area. Policy BE1 states that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout. Policy H8 states that the design and layout of proposals for the alteration or enlargement of residential properties will be required to (i) the

scale, form and materials of construction should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area and (ii) space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.

The property benefits from an existing garage to the side of the property which would be removed. A two storey side extension would be erected which would have a maximum width of 5.1m and depth of 9.1m. The property is located on a triangular shaped plot and as such the extension is set back from the front elevation by 1.786m and increase in width from 3.819m to 5.3m at the rear of the site to follow the boundary. The extension will project 3.5m beyond the original rear elevation (1.2m beyond the existing single storey rear extension).

The proposal would be set back 1.8m from the front of the existing dwelling to provide a degree of subservience to the host dwelling. However, the proposed roof would be gabled and would continue the existing ridge height at 7.2m high for a further 6m in width, before stepping down in height to 6m for a width of 1.25m. The roof also includes a dormer in the rear roofslope with a width of 3.9m and depth of 3.5m. The area is predominantly characterised by hipped roofs to the end of terrace properties, though it is noted that there is one example of a gable end opposite at No.65A. The proposed extension is therefore not considered in keeping with the general character of the area, and would also result in a significant addition of bulk to the existing property.

Furthermore, the proposed two storey extension features a flat roof to the rear. Policy H8 states that flat-roofed side extensions of two or more storeys to dwellings of traditional roof design will normally be resisted, and given the siting of the property on a prominent plot adjacent to the access road, this would not be considered an acceptable design.

The size of the extension would give the appearance of a separate dwelling, similar to that granted under appeal at No. 65 Hillcrest Road under planning ref: 07/00705/FULL1. The extension would include an additional kitchen at ground floor level, an internal staircase and two bedrooms with en-suites at first floor level. Concern is therefore raised over the potential severance of this extension to form a separate dwelling which could result in a substandard accommodation with inadequate privacy, access provision or parking for the future occupiers.

Therefore, given the scale, bulk and design of the proposed extension, it would be considered to result in a detrimental impact on the character of the host dwelling and street scene in general. It is noted that a similar proposal was been granted permission under 06/00482/FULL6 for No.65, however this was granted permission before the Unitary Development Plan was adopted in June 2006, and in any case the current proposal is different in its design and would result in a bulkier addition to the host dwelling.

### Side Space

Policy H9 normally requires proposals of two or more storeys in height to provide a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site for the full height and

length of the flank wall of the building. Whilst the extension would be set back and staggered, it would abut the boundary at separate points and would not provide a minimum side space of 1m for the full length of the flank wall. However, given the property is separated from the boundary of the adjacent site at No.71 by an access road with a width of approximately 3m and therefore the extension would not result in unrelated terracing. It is also noted that a similar application was granted approval under ref: 06/00482/FULL6 at No.65 for a first floor side extension adjacent to the boundary of an access road, and therefore the principle of this would not be out of character or harmful to the existing spatial standards of the area. As such it is considered that the proposal does not conflict with the reason for the side space policy.

### Residential Amenity

Policy BE1 (v) states that the development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring building and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. This is supported within Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

In terms of impact upon the neighbouring properties, the two storey side/rear extension would project beyond the rear of the existing property by 1.2m at ground floor level and 3.5m at first floor level. Given that the extension would be sited a minimum of 5.3m from the boundary with No.75, and therefore is not considered to result in any significant harm to this neighbour in terms of loss of light or outlook. The facing flank wall would be blank and there would be no loss of privacy.

The neighbour at No.71 is separated by the access road which would mitigate the impact of the proposed extension. Furthermore, due to that staggered design of the extension the majority of it would have a further distance away from the boundary and any impact on outlook if therefore not considered substantial. The orientation of the properties is such that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of light to this neighbour. The flank walls would be blank at first floor level and therefore there would be no loss of privacy. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not significant harm the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

### Highways / Parking

The proposed side extension would replace an existing single storey garage which abuts the boundary. The development would therefore result in the loss of one parking space, however there are spaces available within the site's curtilage which would be utilised for parking. Therefore, no objections were raised by Highways Officers, subject to conditions.

### Summary

Having had regard to the above, it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would not respect the character of the host dwelling. It would result in an unacceptable level of additional bulk, harmful to the character of the host dwelling and the streetscene in general.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 16/05798/FULL6 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED**

**The reasons for refusal are:**

- 1 The proposal would result in a bulky form of development and an incongruous addition that does not respect the scale or form of the host dwelling, out of character with the surrounding area, contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.**