

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

Application No : 17/00232/FULL6

Ward:
Plaistow And Sundridge

Address : 6 Lawn Close Bromley BR1 3NA

OS Grid Ref: E: 540708 N: 170490

Applicant : Mr Raymond Duncan

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing porch and erection of single storey front extension

Key designations:

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

Proposal

The site is a detached two storey dwelling house located on the west side of the Lawn Close cul-de-sac. A railway line runs to the rear of the site and the site, at its southern tip, lies adjacent to Garden Road Conservation Area. This application proposes the demolition of existing porch and erection of single storey front extension.

Consultations

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

- Bulk and size - detrimental to present building and to character and appearance of the Close
- Not in keeping, incompatible
- Out of proportion
- Overlooking
- Overdevelopment
- Impact on parking
- Appeal decision rejected front extension
- Affect amenity and use of sitting room
- Concerns a porch would be added to any forward extension - can this be guarded against

Any additional comments in respect of revised neighbour notifications will be reported verbally to Committee.

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

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

London Plan Policy 7.4

The planning history includes permission reference 02/02500 for two storey side and rear extension and canopy to front elevation.

Application, reference 15/05295, was refused permission for single storey front and rear extensions, Roof alterations to form habitable room incorporating rear dormer and elevational alterations. It was refused for the following reasons:

"The proposed development by reason of its size, siting, design, the context within which it sits and relationship to the adjacent dwelling at No 7 would result in a cramped, overbearing form of development harmful to neighbouring amenity, the appearance of the host dwelling and to the street scene generally, contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

The proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site and be out of scale and form of adjacent buildings detrimental to the host dwelling, the street scene and character of the area thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan".

Planning application reference 16/01247, single storey front and rear extensions, roof alterations to form habitable accommodation incorporating rear dormer, was refused for the following reasons:

"The proposed development by reason of its size, siting, design, the context within which it sits and relationship to the adjacent dwelling at No 7 would result in a cramped, overbearing form of development harmful to neighbouring amenity, the appearance of the host dwelling and to the street scene generally, contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan.

The proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site and be out of scale and form of adjacent buildings detrimental to the host dwelling, the street scene and character of the area thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan".

This application, 16/01247, was part allowed on appeal. The appeal decision, dated 29th November 2016, was a split decision and granted planning permission for the erection of single storey rear extension, replacement of existing roof structure, loft conversion and erection of rear dormer extension. The appeal was dismissed as it related to the erection of a single storey front extension.

Application ref 16/03358 for single storey front and rear extension was refused for the following reason:

"The proposal by reason of its siting would result in an overdevelopment of the site and be out of scale and form of adjacent buildings detrimental to the host dwelling, the street scene, character of the area and neighbouring residential amenity thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of Bromley's Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan".

Conclusions

Given the planning history the main consideration in this case is to consider if the proposed front extension is acceptable in terms of its impact on the streetscape and the character and appearance of the area. The Inspector noted that the streetscape is sensitive to the effects of alterations to the frontages of houses.

A number of neighbour objections have been received and are referred to above. Revised notification has been sent to adjoining and nearby owner/occupiers to clarify that this application solely relates to the proposed front extension. It is noted from the planning history that the appeal decision granted planning permission for roof extension and rear dormer and single storey rear extension.

In respect of the hipped roof front extension the Inspector opined that whilst it would appear more noticeable than the existing porch it would not result in the occupiers of No 7 experiencing a greater degree of enclosure than that which already exists. Given the design, size and siting of that now proposed there is no reason to take a different view with this particular scheme.

Objections include a concern that a porch would be added to any forward extension. Given the sensitivities of front extensions in this location and in order to consider impacts on neighbouring amenity, it would be considered appropriate, in the event of a planning permission, to restrict permitted development rights (Class D).

The appeal decision noted that '... existing properties either have modest, glazed, flat roof porches projecting to the front, as the appeal site does, or glazed lobbies adjacent to garages which appear integral to their host buildings' frontages and that the front extension would contrast harmfully with the established pattern of frontages of buildings around Lawn Close.

The existing porch is c 2.3m high x 3.2m wide and 0.9m deep. It is of flat roof design, glazed PVCu and of modest appearance. The proposed development

moves away from a glazed porch structure and will provide a front extension with the main front door leading straight into the enlarged entrance hall. It will be 2.7m high x 4m wide x 0.9m deep. The materials proposed are timber, bricks and stone and white PVCu windows to match existing.

The revised design of the proposed front extension references that of the existing porch in respect of the flat roof design and depth of projection. It will be c 0.4m higher and c 0.8m wider and the proposed materials will signify that this is clearly a front extension as opposed to a front porch. The sensitivities of effects on the streetscape to alterations to the front of houses in this location are already well documented. It is now for careful consideration as to whether the revised proposal is acceptable in this respect.

A front extension in this location is the exception. When considering the merits of the scheme and taking into account: the proposed design; the use of materials to match the host building; that the existing porch (given its use of white PVCu appears as quite a prominent feature) is to be replaced; and subject to the restriction of Permitted Development Rights, that, on balance, the impacts on the street scene will not be so detrimental and it would not result in such a significant loss of amenity to local residents as to warrant a planning refusal.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 17/00232 and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 28.03.2017

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 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 appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area

- 3 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall match those of the existing building and 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.

- 4** 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 D 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 nearby residential amenity and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area and in order to comply with Policies BE1 and BE8 of the Unitary Development Plan and London Plan Policy 7.4.