

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

Application No : 17/00472/FULL1

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 14 Kechill Gardens Hayes Bromley BR2
7NQ

OS Grid Ref: E: 540375 N: 166607

Applicant : Guy Pleasance

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey rear extension.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a proposed single storey rear extension. The proposed extension will have a width of 8.8m, a depth of 4.9m along the adjoining boundary line and 4m along the eastern flank elevation. The height of the proposal will be 2.45m to the eaves level and 3.75m to the pitched roof.

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property located on the south side of Kechill Gardens, Hayes.

Consultations

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

- The large depth of the proposed extension would cause substantial loss of sunlight and daylight to the main living room of my property and would thus be detrimental to the enjoyment of my property.
- Due to the close proximity of the proposed extension to the boundary between the two properties, the extension would be approximately 0.5 from my window of my living room. The close proximity would create a feeling of enclosure and be detrimental to the enjoyment of the principle living area of my property.

- Due to the grading of the land the proposed extension is on higher land and thus would cause increased overshadowing of my garden/patio and be detrimental to the enjoyment of this space.
- The proposed extension would look too dominant and be out of scale in relation to the existing building.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies:

National Planning Policy Framework:

Chapter 7- Requiring Good Design

London Plan:

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.6 Architecture

Unitary Development Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development

H8 Residential Extensions

SPG1 General Design Guidance

SPG2 Residential Design Guidance

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.

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions

Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

Planning History

00/02425/FULL1-Two storey side extension- Application Permitted- Date issued- 04.10.2000

04/01796/FULL6-Gable end and rear dormers incorporating rear balcony- Application Refused- Date issued-12.07.2004

15/02151/FULL6-Roof alterations to incorporate rear dormers with juliet balcony and single storey rear extension- Application Permitted- Date issued-02.09.2015

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

Policies H8, BE1 and the Council's Supplementary design guidance seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality design that respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and are compatible with surrounding development. Consistent with this, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that new development should reflect the identity of local surroundings and add to the overall quality of the area. In particular, Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. Whilst London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 seek to enhance local context and character, as well as encouraging high quality design in assessing the overall acceptability of a proposal.

The proposed rear extension is not anticipated to have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area. The rear extension would be sited to the rear of the host dwelling, well-screened from public vantage points, set into the gradient of the site. Furthermore, the materials for the external surfaces of the building would complement those of the host dwelling, compliant with the Policy Objectives of the UDP, London Plan and NPPF.

Impact on Residential Amenity

The main concern is the possibly loss to amenity to neighbouring properties. Policy BE1 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 overshadowing.

It is noted from the Planning History on the site that permission was previously granted for a rear extension under permission: 15/02151/FULL6. The granted rear extension would project 3.8m along the adjoining line and 3m along the flank elevation. The proposal was not considered to cause any undue loss of amenity to

neighbouring properties due to the low wall height of the eaves level of 2.4m with a hipped roof.

In this instance, the application seeks to increase the depth of the rear extension along the adjoining boundary line to 4.9m. Objections have been raised from the occupiers of the adjoining neighbouring property, with regard to possible loss of sun/daylight, outlook and prospect due to the size and scale of the development.

It is considered that the increase in depth along the adjoining boundary represents a significant material difference from the previously permitted application, increasing the depth by approximately 1.1m. Furthermore, it was noted on the site visit that both properties benefit from a staggered rear wall due to the design and layout of the properties. The existing rear element which protrudes beyond the rear wall of both properties means that by constructing a development of this scale along the boundary line would create an overbearing sense of enclosure to the rear window serving the living room of the neighbouring property, leading to a significant loss of visual harm by reason of loss of outlook, prospect and sun/daylight.

In regards to No.16 it was noted on the site visit that the neighbouring property is set back from the common building line in this section of the road, meaning the rear wall of the neighbouring property protrudes beyond that of the host dwelling. Furthermore, there is considerable separation between the two dwellings. Taking this into account, the proposal is not anticipated to cause any undue loss of outlook or sun/daylight to No.16.

Summary

Taking into account the above, Members may therefore consider that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable the significant scale and depth of the proposal along the adjoining boundary line would result in a substantial loss of outlook, prospect and sun/daylight to the adjoining neighbouring property at No.12, contrary to Policy BE1 of the UDP.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 17/00472 and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

The proposed extension would, by reason of its excessive rearward projection, have a seriously detrimental effect on the outlook and prospect which the occupants of the adjoining dwelling might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1 General Design Principles and No 2 Residential Design Guidance.