

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

**Application No :** 17/01724/FULL6

**Ward:**  
Hayes And Coney Hall

**Address :** 67 Hayes Wood Avenue Hayes Bromley  
BR2 7BQ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 540660 N: 166217

**Applicant :** Ms Kerry Healy

**Objections :** YES

### **Description of Development:**

Loft conversion with roof alterations to include hip to gable extension with rear dormer, and front/side dormer. RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION

Key designations:

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

### **Proposal**

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for a loft conversion with roof alterations to include hip to gable extension with rear dormer, and front/side dormer.

The works have been completed, and has altered the previous hipped element of the dwelling which is a feature of these properties to a side gable which provides a continuation of the ridge height, and features a rear dormer to its rear.

The roof alterations also include a dormer in the front/side roofslope with a width of 2.5m and depth of 3m.

### **Location**

The application site hosts a two storey semi-detached property located on the western side of Hayes Wood Avenue. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it Listed.

### **Consultations**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and the following representations were received;

- Appreciate the desire to create the maximum useable floor space in a loft conversion.
- However it has been carried out to an extreme degree regardless of the envelope created and the impact it would have on the host house and streetscene.
- A refusal of the application would therefore be supported.

## **Planning Considerations**

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan:

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012):

The NPPF confirms that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### London Plan (2016):

7.4 Local Character  
7.6 Architecture

### Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development  
H8 Residential Extensions

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

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

## **Planning History**

The site has previously been the subject of the following applications;

- 03/00683/FULL6 - Two storey rear extension - Refused 14.05.2003
- 04/04316/FULL6 - Part one/two storey rear extension - Permitted 29.12.2004

## **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.

It is noted that there are examples of similar developments within the street such as at No.15 and No.35 however no recent applications have been received by The Council for these properties and no permission has been granted.

The site at No.47 Hayes Wood Avenue has not commenced any works, however has recently been the subject of a number of applications for a similar development. A Lawful Development Certificate (ref: 16/05757/PLUD) was refused on the grounds the proposal does not constitute permitted development under Class B (c) of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as it would result in part of the dwellinghouse extending beyond the plane of the roofslope that forms the principle elevation of the building and fronts a highway.

The site at No.47 is also currently the subject of applications for full planning permission for similar works (ref: 16/05756/FULL6 and 17/05758/FULL6)

The applications were both deferred from Sub-plans committee 1 on the 13th April 2017 to wait for the outcome of the enforcement action in relation to the other properties which have constructed similar developments without planning permission. This application is a result of initial contact from enforcement.

## **Design**

London Plan Policy 7.4 requires developments to have regard to the form, function, and structure of an area. Policy BE1 states that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout. Policy H8 states that the design and layout of proposals for the alteration or enlargement of residential properties will be required to (i) the scale, form and materials of construction should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area and (ii) space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.

The application seeks retrospective planning permission for roof alterations to the previous hipped element of the dwelling to a side gable which provides a continuation of the ridge height, and features a dormer to its rear. The roof alterations also include a dormer in the front/side roofslope with a width of 2.5m and depth of 3m.

There is a general uniformity in the design of the semi-detached properties within the immediate streetscene, including front gables and a hipped roof element to the side. However as noted previously, there are examples of similar developments within the street which have also been constructed without written consent from The Council.

The property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses; both of which originally benefitted from front gables and a hipped roof element to the side. Para 4.4 of policy H8 states that "the enlargement of a roof structure from a hipped design to a gable end is unlikely to be acceptable except in relation to end of terrace dwellings". The proposed hip to gable extension and front/side dormer would significantly alter the character of the host dwelling and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached buildings.

It is noted that the pitch of the roof to the gable extension is steeper than the original hipped roofslope and this has resulted in additional bulk to the property. The proposed rear dormer would also contribute to the bulk of the proposal, and though it would be partially screened from the front by the proposed hip to gable extension it would remain visible. The principle of the addition of a rear dormer to the property is not considered unacceptable in itself, however given the size proposed it would significantly contribute to the additional bulk to the host dwelling.

Given the scale, bulk and design of the roof alterations it is therefore considered that the proposal results in significant harm to the appearance of the host dwelling. It would result in an obtrusive form of development, out of character with the area and streetscene in general.

### Residential Amenity

Policy BE1 (v) states that the development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring building and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. This is supported within Policy 7.6 of the London Plan.

The proposed roof alterations would add significant bulk to the property and whilst this would make the property more dominant in comparison to the neighbouring properties given the siting of the extensions which don't project significantly to the rear it is not considered to result in any significant harm in terms of the loss of light or outlook to neighbouring properties.

The flank wall of the gable would be blank, whilst the front/side dormer would only feature one window serving an en-suite. If permission were forthcoming it would be recommended for a condition to be added to ensure the flank window proposed would be obscure glazed, and that no further windows can be added to the flank window in order to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties.

Any additional overlooking resulting from the rear dormer would not be considered significantly above that which already exists from the existing first floor rear windows, and therefore any impact in terms of loss of privacy would not be significant.

## Summary

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would be a bulky addition which would not respect the character of the host dwelling, and would result in an unbalancing of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, harmful to the visual amenities of the area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 17/01724/FULL6 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

## **RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED**

**The reasons for refusal are:**

- 1        The proposed roof alterations are unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and detrimental to the visual appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses, resulting in an incongruous and unsatisfactory addition to the streetscene, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.**