

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

Application No : 16/05564/FULL6

**Ward:
Clock House**

**Address : Broadwater Cottage Blakeney Road
Beckenham BR3 1HA**

OS Grid Ref: E: 536797 N: 169845

Applicant : Mr Roger Martin

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part 1/2 storey front/side/rear extensions. Roof alterations incorporating dormers to rear and rooflights to front. Alterations to fenestration layout, elevational alterations and conversion of garage to habitable room.

Key designations:

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

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the substantial alteration and enlargement of the host dwelling to provide extended living accommodation. The submitted plans show the retention of only a minority of the existing walls of the dwelling, with the demolition of a substantial proportion of the dwelling and external alteration including stone/brick overcladding such that the resultant dwelling would have an entirely remodelled appearance.

The front flat roof single storey projection would be demolished and the entire front of the property clad in stone and brick. Regularly spaced window openings would be provided to ground and first floors.

The roof would be enlarged to incorporate a gable end to each side, with 8 front roof lights. The ridgeline of the dwelling as extended would be approx. 1.2m higher than the existing ridgeline. The rear elevation which faces south east would incorporate three regularly spaced dormer windows which would be set lower than the extended ridgeline.

A two storey side extension would be erected to the north eastern flank elevation, facing into the large side gardens. The extension would be set back from the remodelled front elevation of the dwelling with a subservient roof in terms of the ridge height, but incorporating a gable end and an entrance door which would lead to what is annotated as a storage area on the submitted plans.

At the rear the rear elevation would be over clad in materials to match those utilised on the front and side elevations. The existing conservatory and study would be demolished and replaced by a large two storey rear extension which would lie between the existing two storey rear projection and the south western flank elevation of the dwelling. This extension would align with the existing south western elevation (and would be over clad in stone/brick) and would have a depth of approx. 4m. The existing south western flank elevation of the dwelling is positioned in close proximity to the boundary of the site. The proposed extension would be no nearer to the boundary than the existing flank elevation of the dwelling but would, as a consequence of the first floor and roof extensions above, be higher and deeper than the development as existing in relation to this boundary.

The rear elevation would be altered to include three regularly spaced sets of bi-fold doors with 9 regularly spaced windows at first floor level, with the entire rear elevation clad in brick/stone.

Site and surroundings

The application site lies to the south west of Blakeney Road and is broadly triangular in shape. It is accessed via a narrow vehicular access from Blakeney Road which runs over the open River Beck. The site widens beyond the access point and is bounded to the north by the railway line/embankment. To the south west the application site is bounded in part by a parking area associated with the development at Turners Meadow Way and predominantly by the garaging and manoeuvring space associated with Ashton Court, a residential development accessed from Hayne Road.

The site measures approx. 0.085 hectares.

The host dwelling is oriented with the front elevation facing north west, towards what would appear from the highway as the side boundary. The north eastern and south western elevations of the dwelling face Blakeney Road and the garaging at Ashton Court respectively. To the south east of the application site, beyond what is used as the main rear garden of the dwelling, is Riverside School.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received. Any comments received will be reported verbally.

Technical comments

The Environment Agency was consulted on the application but no comments have been received. Any comments received will be updated verbally.

From a technical highways perspective no objections are raised.

No objections are raised from an Environmental Health perspective.

Network Rail/TFL have been consulted since the site's northern boundary is located adjacent to a railway embankment. Any comments received will be updated verbally at the Committee meeting.

Planning Considerations

Unitary Development Plan policies of relevance to the proposal comprise:

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

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. A period of consultation on the proposed draft Local Plan (under the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended) ran from November 2016 and closed on December 31st 2016. It is anticipated that the draft Local Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State in 2017.

Draft local plan policies of relevance to the determination of the application comprise:

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

London Plan

London Plan policies of relevance to the determination of the application comprise:

Policy 7.4	Local Character
Policy 7.6	Architecture

National Planning Policy Framework

The NPPF is a material consideration in the determination of the application.

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

91/00767

Planning permission was granted for a two storey side extension.

06/03453

Planning permission was refused for the demolition of the existing house and garage and the erection of a four storey block comprising 6 two bedroom flats. Permission was refused on the grounds:

1. The proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site, out of character with the area and contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed design would be unsympathetic to the area and detrimental to its visual amenities thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. The proposed development would be detrimental to the amenities now enjoyed by the residents of occupiers adjoining the site by reason of loss of light, prospect and privacy, thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

A subsequent appeal against the refusal of planning permission was allowed.

Permission was granted under reference 11/00265 for an extension of the time limit for the implementation of the permission granted on appeal.

Under reference 14/01073 the variation of condition 7 of permission 11/002665 to allow the provision of an amended parking layout was approved.

Conclusions

The main issues in the determination of this application are the impact of the proposal on the visual and residential amenities of the area. The planning history of the site which includes the granting of planning permission on appeal for a four storey residential block (for which the timescale for the implementation of the development was extended in 2011 under reference 11/00265) is a material planning consideration.

Impact on visual amenity

With regards to the impact of the proposal on the visual amenities of the area and the appearance of the host dwelling, it is noted that the existing house is neither locally nor statutorily listed and the site does not lie in a designated conservation area. In assessing the proposals it is acknowledged that if the development was to be implemented the appearance of the dwelling would be comprehensively altered such that the resultant development would bear little relation to the existing dwelling which is of more modest appearance and appears to have been the subject of previous piecemeal extension.

The position of the dwelling in relation to the street and to neighbouring property would have the result of effectively limiting the impact of the proposal on visual amenity. It would not be readily visible in context with neighbouring development from either public or private vantage points, with the visual impact principally relating to the view of the dwelling from the parking and garaging associated with neighbouring residential development, which appears to lie on slightly higher ground than the host dwelling and which is separated from the site by a high brick

wall. Views of the site are also partially screened by mature trees in neighbouring sites.

The resultant dwelling would have an imposing appearance and the detailing, including multiple entrance points leads to a somewhat incongruous appearance and the impression of terraced rather than detached residential development. It falls to determine the application on the basis of the information submitted which refers to the extension of a single dwellinghouse, and in view of the siting and relative seclusion of the property it is not considered that the visual impact of the proposals would be so severe as to warrant the refusal of planning permission.

The proportions and external appearance of the resultant dwelling would bear little relation to the proportions and appearance of the host dwelling and in this respect the appearance of the development would not complement that of the existing dwelling. The relationship between the site and surrounding residential development would result in the extended dwelling having no significant impact on the wider visual amenity and character of the locality. While the extensions would materially and significantly alter the appearance of the host dwelling, the dwelling as existing is not protected by way of listing or siting within a conservation area and the siting of the dwelling in a secluded position would result in there being no unduly awkward or incongruous juxtaposition between existing and new development.

While the altered and extended flank elevation of the dwelling (including the over cladding) would be sited within close proximity to the side boundary, this reflects the unusual position of the dwelling within the site, with the front elevation being sited almost perpendicular to Blakeney Road and the side (rear) elevation in question being positioned immediately adjacent to what is in effect the rear boundary of the site. As such, while the development would not provide 1m side space to the boundary, the proposal would result in no unrelated terracing or perceived loss of spaciousness within the street scene.

Impact on residential amenity

With regards to the impact of the proposal on residential amenity, the siting of the dwelling in relation to neighbouring houses is such that although the amount of first floor and roof fenestration would be significantly greater than is currently the case, the proposal would be unlikely to result in any significant degree of overlooking or loss of privacy. Similarly, while the height and depth of the south western flank elevation would be increased, that part of the dwelling is sited sufficiently distant from neighbouring residential dwellings and gardens so as to limit the visual impact of the proposal and the impact in terms of loss of light or prospect.

Summary

The extensions and alterations would result in the complete remodelling of the dwelling. However the siting of the dwelling in relation to surrounding development, its relative seclusion and lack of frontage visibility would result in the development having no significant impact on the visual amenities and character of the locality. With regards to residential amenity, the proposal would have no undue impact on

amenity by way of visual impact, loss of privacy or outlook or resulting in loss of daylight and sunlight.

as amended by documents received on 28.02.2017

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 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and / or drawings unless otherwise 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 appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

- 3 Before commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted parking spaces and/or garages and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (England) 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

- 4 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 the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area and to accord with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

- 5 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no building, structure or alteration permitted by Class A, B, C, or E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended), shall be erected or made within the curtilage(s) of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area and to prevent an overdevelopment of the site.