

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

Application No : 17/01845/FULL6

Ward:
Kelsey And Eden Park

Address : 33 Greenways Beckenham BR3 3NQ

OS Grid Ref: E: 537381 N: 168994

Applicant : Mr Novica Jevric

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey rear and first floor side extensions

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 18

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for roof alterations to incorporate first floor side extension and a single storey rear extension. Demolition of the existing conservatory, garage and car port is also proposed.

The proposed first floor extension would be situated above the existing study and would span the full depth of the host dwelling and would incorporate a hipped roof at a 40 degree angle. The plans show two bedrooms and a bathroom are to be added to the side of the property. The proposed single storey rear extension measures 3.6m in depth & 2.8m (closest to the adjoining neighbour), 9.1m in width x 3.7m in height with four rooflights.

The application has been 'called-in' by a ward Councillor.

Location

The application site comprises one half of a pair of two storey semi-detached properties located on the north eastern side of Greenways, Beckenham. The property is of brick and tile construction and benefits from a front drive and car port. The surrounding area is residential in character with housing of varying architectural styles

Consultations

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

- This planning application follows 'close on the heels' of a Certificate of Lawfulness issued in October 2016. Building works to the roof-space are currently underway. The new build (albeit obscured by scaffolding at present) imposes on the street scene & skyline notably & to further exacerbate this by the addition of further bulk & mass to the side is very much to the detriment of both the host building & the street scene.
- This new application bears some similarities to a refused planning application (2015) and a subsequent appeal which was not upheld (2016), for example it includes an additional window to the front .
- All of the semi-detached houses are in pairs. The first floor side extension would dramatically and detrimentally affect the character of the property, the symmetry of the building being a major feature of the period and this has been and will be further deteriorated.
- The addition of another window to the front of the property would not match the adjoining property
- The current application should be refused for the same reasons as the previous application & appeal.
- There is an issue that the increased height at the border will affect privacy and light.
- The only difference is that the roof hip/line to the proposed side extension is in actual fact longer than was previously rejected with a resultant style that is entirely out of keeping with the street scene.

Full copies of objections from neighbours are contained on the Planning Application file.

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 - General Design Principles
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 - Residential Design Guidance

The London Plan and national Planning Policy Framework are also key considerations in the determination of this application.

The above policies are considered to be consistent with the principles and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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 draft Local Plan will be 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.

Planning History

Under planning application reference: 16/04983/PLUD a Certificate of Lawfulness was permitted for a hip to gable roof extension, three front rooflights and loft conversion to include a rear dormer extension.

Application Reference: 16/02810 was also dismissed at appeal on 24th October 2016 with the Inspector commenting that the proposed first floor side extension would not show any subordination to the host dwelling and no recess from the façade would mean that the greater width brought about by the side extension would imbalance the relationship between the appeal dwelling at No.35.

Under planning application reference: 16/02810 planning permission was refused for roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer and three rooflights to front roof slope, single storey rear extension, first floor side extension and elevational alterations. The application was refused for the following reason:-

"The proposed first floor side extension and roof alterations by reason of its design, prominent siting, scale and mass would harm the open and spacious setting of the streetscene and would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the host and adjoining dwelling contrary Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and SPG 1 General Design Principles & SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance".

Under planning application reference: 15/04063 planning permission was refused for roof extension to incorporate rear dormer and single storey rear extension. The application was refused for the following reason:-

"The proposed first floor side extension and roof alterations by reason of its design, prominent siting, scale and mass would harm the open and spacious setting of the streetscene and would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the host and adjoining dwelling contrary Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and SPG 1 General Design Principles & SPG 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 amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

This is the fourth planning permission submitted for the site since January 2016. Three of the four planning applications have been refused as set out in the planning history section above. A Certificate of Lawfulness for a hip to gable roof extension, three front rooflights and loft conversion to include a rear dormer extension was permitted as the submitted drawings complied with permitted development legislation. This permission has been built out by the applicant and effectively unbalances the pair of semi-detached properties with No.33 having a gabled ended roof. The rear dormer extension has also been built out.

The applicant is now seeking to build a first floor side extension and single storey rear extension, similar to that proposed under planning application reference: 16/02810 which was refused by the Council in August 2016 and then subsequently dismissed at appeal.

Policy BE1 of the UDP requires new buildings to complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas, and seeks to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Policy H8 of the UDP requires residential extensions to blend with the style and materials of the host dwelling, and ensure that spaces or gaps between buildings are respected where these contribute to the character of the area.

Policy H9 of the UDP requires that when considering applications for new residential development, including extensions, the Council will normally require for a proposal of two or more storeys in height, a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site should be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building or where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space. This will be the case on some corner properties.

Design

As a semi-detached property it is important to consider whether the proposal would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings or appear unduly bulky and top heavy in the context of the host dwelling. The appeal inspector when considering planning application 16/16/02810 dismissed the appeal for two main reasons 1) that the first floor side extension would not show any subordination to the host dwelling and 2) that there would be no recess from the façade resulting in a greater width brought about by the side extension which would imbalance the relationship between the appeal dwelling at No.35. No.33 has become unbalanced from its neighbour by virtue of the fact that the hip to gable roof alterations have been built.

The first floor side extension, whilst having a hipped roof and sitting down from the main ridge height would still sit flush with the existing front building line. Furthermore the relationship between the first floor side extension and that of the gable end roof would look awkward and contrived and would appear detrimental when viewed as part of the street scene. For this reason the Council considers that planning permission should be refused.

It was noted from the site visit that immediate surrounding properties remain un-extended at first floor level but that some in the wider area have been extended but at a time preceding current UDP policies.

The proposed single storey extension would be located to the rear and the property not visible from the public realm. The overall size and design is considered acceptable and in keeping with the host dwelling. In relation to the proposed dormer extension this too is located to the rear and the dimensions proposed are considered acceptable. The Inspector also agreed as part of application reference: 16/02810 that the single storey rear extension was acceptable.

Neighbouring amenity

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.

The main impact of the proposal would be on No 35 Greenways which is located to the south of the application site. The proposed rear extension would abut the common boundary with this property; however the depth of the extension on this side is modest at 2.8m. The single storey extension would not be significantly deeper than the existing conservatory at the host dwelling.

The first floor of the proposed first floor extension would be set away from the flank party boundary with sufficient separation retained to limit the impact of this part of the proposals on the residential amenities of the adjoining dwelling No.31.

Whilst a new window is proposed to the side at first floor this can be obscure glazed being a bathroom. The size and position of the first floor addition would add additional bulk and mass to the property but on balance isn't considered to give rise to a loss of privacy or overlooking.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 17/01845/FULL6, 16/04983/PLUD, 16/02810/FULL6 & 15/04063/FULL6 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:

- 1. The proposed first floor side extension and roof alterations by reason of its design, prominent siting, scale and mass would harm the open and spacious setting of the streetscene and would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the host and adjoining dwelling contrary Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and SPG 1 General Design Principles & SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance.**