

## **SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration**

**Application No :** 17/00256/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**West Wickham**

**Address :** 124 Copse Avenue West Wickham BR4  
9NP

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 537796 N: 164877

**Applicant :** Mrs Angela Walters

**Objections :** YES

### **Description of Development:**

Part 1/2 storey front/side/rear extensions to include elevational alterations. Roof alterations to form habitable space incorporating side dormers and rooflight.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Smoke Control SCA 51

### **Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a part one/part two front/side and rear extension and elevational alterations. Roof alterations to form habitable space incorporating side dormer window and roof lights.

The application is a resubmission of a similar planning application (ref: 16/03991) refused on 27th October 2016. The current application is accompanied by a Design & Access Statement.

The application site is a detached corner property located on the western side of Copse Avenue on the corner with Inchwood & Woodland Way, West Wickham.

### **Consultations**

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

Whilst we appreciate that alterations to the original application have been made, the proposed development still represents an unacceptable impact upon our visual and residential amenities by reason of its bulk, scale and depth, contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

We have the following specific observations to make:

1. We still consider this to be an overdevelopment and overly dominant. Whilst the garage footprint has been pared down slightly, the 1st and 2nd floors have been

increased considerably. This is a very significant overdevelopment when compared to the size of the original property.

2. Whilst the proposed new plans have removed the dormers from the side facing ourselves, these have been replaced with quite dominant velux windows which will afford views straight into our property. Whereas the current roof plan includes hips and valleys allowing light into our property, the proposed roofline will be higher than the valleys [and flat] so will have a massive impact on the light entering our property at both floor levels.

3. The proposed roof plan is not in keeping with the traditional and existing pitched roof. The proposed roof is largely flat and includes a dormer at the side. We feel this would be harmful to the streetscene and character of the area.

4. The increased development at 1st floor level will further encroach on the light to our property. The size of the 1st floor development does not respect the scale and form of the original property or other properties in the surrounding area. Also the fenestration on the proposed rear elevation consists of full height doors, again havig a significant impact on our privacy.

5. The garden room extension at ground floor level would extend beyond the rear level of all neighbouring properties; other neighbours have already had restrictions imposed to ensure privacy is maintained. The proposal will not only further reduce our views of the woods but we would be left looking at a blank flank wall instead. The proposed garden room will overlook our garden and our patio privacy will be severely compromised. The height of our fence is already 6' 6" from the level of our patio and to increase it further - as suggested in the planning statement - would impact further on our rights to light at our property.

When reviewing the reasons for refusal to the 2016 application [16/03991/FULL6], it appears that points 1 and 2 have not been properly addressed. We therefore request that permission for the proposed development is refused.

### **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

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) documents are also a consideration in the determination of planning applications. These are:

SPG No1 - General Design Principles  
SPG No2 - Residential Design Guidance

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 draft Local Plan will be submitted to the Secretary of State in mid-2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

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

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

### **Planning History**

Under planning application ref: 16/03991 planning permission was refused for elevational alterations, first floor side extension, two storey rear extension and roof alterations to incorporate roof lights and side and rear dormers.

The application was refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed dormer windows by reason of their bulk and design, would be an over dominate feature and have a detrimental impact upon the appearance of the host building and wider street scene, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed bulk, design and depth of the two storey side and single storey rear extensions would be out of character with an detrimental to the appearance of the host building, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. The proposed two storey side extension would by reason of its height, siting and lack of adequate side space would fail to comply with the requirements of Policy H9 in respect of the provision of minimum of 1m side space for the full height and length of the development, contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Under planning application reference: 95/01726 planning permission was granted for a two storey side and single storey side and rear extension.

Under planning application reference: 06/02559 planning permission was refused for a detached garden building (retrospective application). This application was also dismissed at appeal.

### **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.

Following the refusal of the last application the agent has sought to redesign the scheme. The main changes include:

1. Proposed new garage has been reduced in width to be offset from the boundary by 1m to comply with Policy H9.
2. Dormer extension has been removed from the rear elevation
3. Change in the design of the dormer windows in flank elevation (facing Inchwood)
4. Double height velux windows in the flank elevation (facing the neighbours at No.122).
5. The depth of the two storey rear extension has been reduced
6. Rear single storey been reduced

### 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, 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.

Policy H9 also requires proposals of two or more storeys in height to be a minimum of 1m from the side boundary, which has been provided in this case.

Guidance contained in SGP2 (Residential Design Guidance) at paragraph 1.4 states "The majority of buildings in Bromley have traditional pitched roof forms, contributing greatly to the streetscape and roofspace of their localities. Roof alterations should be carefully considered to ensure they respect the form and appearance of the existing roof".

The property forms a detached dwelling located at the end of Copse Avenue and the corner of Inchwood. The property in its current form retains a traditional hipped roof with a garage built up to the boundary. The property has been extended to the side with planning permission being granted in 1995. The property also benefits from off street parking with a driveway for two cars. The properties along Copse Avenue are very uniform in their design, mass and materials. It is noted that several properties have been extended, mainly to the rear.

The host property has been previously extended under planning application reference:- 95/01726 for a two storey side and single storey side and rear extensions. The current proposal seeks to reconfigure the host dwelling and add additional development to the front, sides and rear of the property.

To the front elevation a new fronted bare brick gable end is proposed in the middle of the property and a first floor extension added with roof slope to the boundary with Inchwood. The existing garage is to be made narrower to allow the development to comply with the Council's side space policy. The existing chimney is also to be relocated to allow for the proposed loft conversion. The first floor side extension (on the flank elevation with Inchwood) proposes three new sets of windows at first floor level and a large dormer window set within the newly created roofspace. To the rear a single storey rear extension is to be added adding 3.9m in depth to the property together with a first floor rear extension and additional roof slope. The first floor side extension continues to the opposite flank elevation (shared with the boundary with No.122) resulting in a new gable end and will result in the first floor increasing by another 3m in depth. Double height velux windows will be added to the roofspace.

Internally the kitchen/living/dining space to be enlarged with the main increase being the single storey element. At first floor the existing layout is to be reconfigured with one of the existing bedrooms being lost to create a library, enlarged ensuite, enlarged rear bedroom and one newly created bedroom. The loft is to be utilised to create one new bedroom, dining room, bathroom, games room and living area.

Dormer extensions are common place in the Borough however the size of the loft conversion will require the roof pitch to be raised and a large side dormer extension added to the side of the property. The dormer window on the flank elevation facing Inchwood has been moved from the rear (as proposed under the previous application) to occupy a more central position in the roof slope however the windows (8 in total) have meant a greater degree of glazing which will look out onto Spring Park.

The changes to the roof would result in changes to the host dwelling and wider street scene which on balance are considered to harm the architectural style and appearance of the host building. The side dormer extension would result in a bulky and unsympathetic form of development, which relates poorly to the form and scale of the existing property and roof slope. The proposal has not therefore overcome the previous reason for refusal and would be contrary to Policy BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed first floor development is also considered an overdevelopment of the property extending 3m in depth at first floor level which will elongate the property to the sides and rear. It will mean that the property will be considered bulky and will result in an unsympathetic form of development.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would measure between 2.8m - 3.9m in depth. It is noted that the rear elevation has already been significantly modified and to add further development would make the property appear overly bulky despite only being single storey.

The elevational alterations on all elevations are not considered overly sympathetic and the changes to the fenestration to the front and rear of the property in particular would be at odds with the character of the streetscene within the wider

area. The increase in glazing to the rear of the property would also be a marked increase in the number of windows which currently reside the rear elevation particularly at first floor level.

Whilst it is noted that No.120 Copse Avenue has been extended at first floor level back in 2002 under planning application reference 02/02826 the development would not be as much as that proposed by No.124. Overall, the increase in the footprint of whole of the original property in particular to the side and rear is considered bulky and an overdevelopment of the plot size.

### Neighbouring amenity

Policy BE1(v) of the UDP that new development will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal does not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to adjacent occupiers by reducing the amount of daylight, sunlight or privacy they enjoy or result in an un-neighbourly sense of enclosure. This is supported by Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

With the host dwelling being a corner property the sole impact is the neighbours at No.122 Copse Avenue. The neighbours has raised objections to several issues including; the proposal being an overdevelopment of the property; dominant velux rooflights; negative impact to the street scene in view of the changes to the roof; loss of light and privacy; the proposed development is a marked increase on what has been allowed to other properties in Copse Avenue.

With the property already being extended the neighbours at No.122 will see an increase in of 3m in depth at first floor and 2.8m at ground floor level. The increased bulk and mass to the property would mean the neighbours will be faced with looking at a bear flank wall located only 1m from the shared boundary. Whilst the single storey extension would be off-set from the boundary by 4.6m the total increases at ground, first and second floors would result in a loss of prospect and enclosure. The privacy of the residents of neighbours would also be impacted with the first floor in particular being located closer to the boundary and create overlooking and a loss of privacy to their rear patio/garden. The resultant overlooking and lack of privacy is considered to be unacceptable.

The resultant first floor extension and roof alterations/loft conversion are also considered to result in a loss of daylight and sunlight, as well as overshadowing and an unacceptable visual impact and loss of prospect, which is detrimental to the residential amenities the neighbouring property currently enjoys and contrary to policy H8 and BE1 of the UDP.

The agent has provided a detailed rebuttal to the neighbours comments which is available on file for Members to view.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents and impact detrimentally on the character of the surrounding area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) DC/17/00256 & 16/03991 as set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

## **RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED**

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1. The proposed dormer window would be an over dominant feature and have a detrimental impact upon the appearance of the host building and wider street scene, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of Unitary Development Plan.**
- 2. The proposed bulk, design and depth of the first floor side and single storey rear extensions would be out of character with and detrimental to the appearance of the host building, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of Unitary Development Plan.**
- 3. The proposed bulk and depth of the first floor extension would mean a loss of prospect and amenity to the neighbours at No.122 Copse Avenue thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.**