

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

Application No : 17/00088/FULL6

Ward:
West Wickham

Address : 90 Hayes Chase West Wickham BR4
0JA

OS Grid Ref: E: 538965 N: 167383

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Gareth & Lorna Exton

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey front/side and part one/two storey rear extensions and elevational alterations

Key designations:

Area of Special Residential Character
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 2

Proposal

The application seeks consent for the construction of a two-storey side/rear extension and a single-storey extension to the front and side.

The proposed two-storey side extension would measure 2.5m in width and would be 7m deep, however it would not extend to the full depth of the host dwelling. The single-storey side element would be set to the rear of the two-storey element would measure 5.8m in depth. It would incorporate a pitched roof, with an eaves height of 3m and a ridge height of 4m. The rear extension would sit above an existing 4m deep ground floor addition. It would measure 3m in depth at first floor level and would incorporate a pitched roof. Amendments would also be made to the front elevation, including a 0.8m deep forward porch projection, which extends above the door, garage and ground floor window.

Location

The application relates to a two-storey detached residential dwelling, which benefits from a detached garage and off-street parking. A garden measuring 37m in depth is located to the rear of the property. There is also a group Tree Preservation Order for the trees within the rearmost section of the garden. The properties to the rear of the site are situated within an Area of Special Residential Character.

Consultations

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

- Little evidence of revision that would give grounds for favourable review of their proposals. Original comments to previous scheme remain. What remains in this application is what was unacceptable in the first place.
- Previous extensions within Hayes Chase should not be used as precedent. Each case must be decided on its own merits. A balance of both supported and unsupported proposals should exist and is vital in sustaining the confidence of all parties who place their trust in the wisdom of the Planning Team.
- Questions regarding why the applicant purchased a modest 3 bed dwelling, when the intention to extend. Concerns about Bromley Planning role in this market strategy of exploitation of more generous ground of older properties, resulting in an ugly ribbon of development of houses, which extend up to their boundary limits. Planning team's protestations that proposals are each assessed on their specific merits are open to challenge.
- Neighbours exercised their free choice in making the purchase of their property and now seek to do so again by extending the house to its limits. We are confronted with accepting either a grotesque imposition or abandoning our home.
- Importance of space in maintaining the wellbeing of urban communities. There is an encroachment upon privately-owned green space with the erection of structures.
- Harm to environment, sense of place etc. through thoughtless development,
- The development is ugly
- Cumulative addition to an already overextended house.
- It is bulky, overbearing structure, encroaching and overshadowing neighbouring property.
- Increased noise and disturbance from close proximity of side elevation and 3 double door openings to the rear of the house.
- Party wall concerns
- Concern about services including drainage and water supply
- Scale and design out of keeping with the original building and the immediate context of neighbouring properties
- Extension to within 1m of the boundary will diminish heavily shaded walk way to a dark alley. Unsympathetic to original properties
- Substantial infilling of the space between the properties, which by the intent of the original architects and ethos of district planning, were overtly and generously detached.
- Not in keeping with the road.

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

SPG 1 General Design Principles
SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance

Emerging Plans

According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF decision makers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

As set out in paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework, emerging plans gain weight as they move through the plan making process.

The following emerging plans are relevant to this application.

Draft Local Plan

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 the submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State will be in the early part of 2017.

Relevant policies:

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions
Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

Planning History

85/01240/FUL - Single-Storey extension. Permission 19.06.1985

16/04715/FULL6 - Part one/two storey front/side and rear extension. Refused 09.12.2016

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed two-storey side and rear extension, by reason of its size, scale and location would result in a dominant and overbearing form of development, harmful to the visual amenities of No 92 Hayes Chase by way

of a loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure contrary to Policies BE1 Design of New Development and H8 Residential Extensions of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1 General Design Principles and No 2 Residential Design Guidance.

2. The proposed two-storey side and rear extension, by reason of its size, scale and design would result in a bulky and unsympathetic form of development, which does not respect or complement the scale and form of the host dwelling, harmful to its character and appearance contrary to Policies BE1 Design of New Development and H8 Residential Extensions of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1 General Design Principles and No 2 Residential Design Guidance.

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. Consideration should also be given to the previous reasons for refusal.

Design

Policies H8, BE1 and the Council's Supplementary design guidance seek to ensure that new development, including residential extensions are of a high quality design that respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development.

In addition to the above policies, Policy H9 of the UDP relates specifically to side space and seeks a minimum of 1m side space to prevent a cramped appearance within the streetscene and to safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring properties for development, including residential extensions, of two storeys or more.

The application property is a modest two-storey detached dwelling. The streetscene comprises a number of detached and semi-detached residential properties, however there is no defining architectural style. It is noted that the host dwelling and immediate neighbours' benefit from a more generous spatial relationship, due to detached garages located between each of properties. The spaces and gaps between other buildings within the streetscene do however vary in width and generally contribute to the spatial qualities of the area.

The proposal would see the construction of a two-storey side extension. There are a number of properties within the street which have been extended in a similar manner, including No 95, 77 and 73 Hayes Chase. The application property is however set within a row of residential dwellings which do not appear to have been significantly extended to the side/front. The neighbouring property to the south (No 92) has an original front facing gable and there is a pair of semi-detached dwellings to the north. No 92 is unusual in that it incorporates a gable end adjacent to the

common side boundary. The relationship and spatial standards between this property and the proposed development would therefore appear more cramped due to the unusual relationship at roof level. However, whilst it is acknowledged that the space between the dwellings would be reduced, it would still retain a minimum 1m set-back as required by Policy H9. In this case, the relationship and reduction in space between the buildings is considered to be on balance acceptable, due to its compliance with policy H9, the varied widths that exist between neighbouring properties and architectural variety within the streetscene.

The applicant has amended the scheme since the previous refusal and it no longer includes a two-storey wrap around element. The depth of the side addition has been reduced and the first floor rear projection has been set back from the common boundary. Amendments have also been made to the roof profile of the rear addition, which is now pitched back and is more complimentary to the form of the original house. A single-storey side addition has been included to the rear of the two-storey side addition and would continue around the rear elevation for a depth of 1m, however this maintains the depth of the existing ground floor element.

The reductions in the size of the two-storey side extension and amendments to the roof profile have lessened the overall bulk of the scheme. Objections have been raised regarding the extent of the development and whilst it is acknowledged that the immediate neighbours have not been extended to this degree, there are large two-storey rear extensions within the street, including No 54 Hayes Chase. The overall size of the plot is considered to be generous and the development would not be out of proportion within this context. Subject to the use of matching materials, which can be controlled by way of a condition, it is considered that the current proposal is more complimentary to the scale and form of the host property and has therefore, on balance, overcome the previous reason for refusal.

The application also proposes the construction of a front extension at ground floor level. The size and scale of the front projection is not considered to be out of keeping with surrounding development. There are numerous porch extensions and projections of various sizes within the street. The development in general would result in the loss of a number of traditional features, such as a first floor corner window and porch, however given the architectural variety within the street, this is not considered significantly harmful.

Neighbouring amenity

Policy BE1 also seeks to ensure that new development proposals, including residential extensions respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and that their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by loss of outlook or overshadowing.

The proposed part one/two-storey side extension would be located 1m from the common side boundary with No 92 Hayes Chase. This property is located to the south west of the application site and benefits from a modest sized single-storey rear extension. This extension is curved and includes windows and doors partially facing the common side boundary. The rear of this property also differs from the host dwelling in that it incorporates a cat-slide roof and a small rear dormer. The

two-storey side extension has been reduced in depth and would no longer project significantly beyond the rear of No 92. A single-storey addition would now be located to the rear of this two-storey side element, however this would include a roof which pitches away from the common boundary and there is also a 1m set back. The first floor rear extension would be set back from the common side boundary with No 92 by 3.2m. The development would result in some visual impact; however the two-storey side element would no longer project beyond the rear of the neighbouring property and would not breach the 45 degree splay. Setting back the first floor rear elevation would also lessen the dominance and bulk of the scheme from the rear windows and amenity space. No 92 is located to the south west and whilst there may be some loss of light in the mornings, the overall orientation would prevent any unacceptable harm.

A number of windows are located within the north facing elevation; however these are secondary and/or serve non-habitable rooms. The generous size and width of the rear garden, coupled with the amendments would also help ensure a sense of openness is retained at the rear. On balance, the visual impacts on the amenities of No 92 are now considered to be acceptable.

No 88 is located to the north west of the application site and has not been extended at the rear. This property forms one half of a semi-detached pair and is separated from the proposal by a detached garage. This garage provides a degree of separation, which would lessen the visual dominance of the proposed rear extension. Furthermore, the generous depth and width of the rear gardens would ensure a sense of openness was retained. There are a number of windows and doors located within the side elevation of No 88; however the spacing between the development and this flank elevation would not result in significantly intrusive form of development. The orientation would result in some overshadowing, but the generous garden depth and width would mitigate this harm.

In relation to overlooking and privacy the proposed development would include windows within the front, side and rear elevations. There is already an established degree of overlooking towards the front and rear of the property and the windows facing these directions would not result in a level of overlooking which is materially worse than the current situation. There are a number of existing small windows within the south west facing side elevation at both ground and first floor levels. The proposal would see the installation of two windows within this elevation, with one at one ground and first floor level. The ground floor windows would face a fence and their height would not result in overlooking. The upper level window would serve a bathroom and could therefore be reasonably conditioned to be obscured glazed and non-opening in order to protect neighbouring amenity.

Concerns have been raised regarding the services to neighbouring properties and foundations, however these fall beyond the scope of this planning assessment and are dealt with under different legislative regimes.

Having had regard to the above, it is considered that the development has sufficiently addressed the previous reasons for refusal and would now be acceptable in that it would not result in significant harm to property or streetscene.

The reductions would also, on balance, prevent unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential properties.

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 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed window(s) in the south west elevation at first floor level shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy Level 3 and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and the window (s) shall subsequently be permanently retained in accordance as such.**

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of nearby residential properties and to accord with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan