

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

UPDATE

This application was deferred by Members at Plans Sub Committee 3 on 9th May 2017 to seek amendments to the roof designs to lessen the impact of the extensions to the neighbours at No.122.

Following the deferral of the application on the 9th May the agent submitted revised drawings on 15th June 2017. The main changes comprise the following:-

- The dormer window to the left hand flank elevation has been redesigned
- The right hand corner at first floor, which was previously shown to be an en-suite bathroom, has been completely removed.
- The accommodation in the roof space and roof has been redesigned.

The report has been updated to reflect the revised drawings submitted.

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:

Updated neighbour comments

Whilst we appreciate that a slight alteration has been made to the drawings considered at the Planning Sub Committee on 9th May 2017, the proposed development remains largely unchanged. It 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.

In the spirit of compromise, we would accept the proposed development with the following changes:

1. If the roofline remained with hips and valleys to our side then we would see this as an acceptable outcome.

The Councillors at the Planning Meeting sought amendments to the roof design.

The revised plans for the roof haven't properly addressed the concerns raised and the roof still remains mainly flat, not only is this contravening SPG2, but this would also have a big impact on our right to light in our property. In addition, the double-sized velux windows on our side would affect our privacy.

2. If the rear extension was to come out no further than the existing line of the property we would see this as an acceptable outcome. This would then limit the reduction to our right to light and would improve the visual impact of a blank flank wall, retaining our views of the woods.

The Councillors at the Planning Meeting sought changes to lessen the impact of the extension on 122 Copse Avenue.

As the plans stand, the proposed garden room extension to the back of the house would extend beyond the rear level of all neighbouring properties. At the Planning Sub Committee meeting on 9th May 2017, one of councillors expressed concern about the scale of the development which he termed as a "wrap around" and this matter has not been addressed by the latest set of plans.

We would welcome visits from members of the Planning Sub Committee so that our objections can be fully appreciated.

Original neighbour comments

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 having 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 deferral of the application on the 9th May the agent has submitted revised drawings. The main changes comprise the following:-

- The dormer window to the left hand flank elevation has been redesigned
- The right hand corner at first floor, which was previously shown to be an en-suite bathroom, has been completely removed.
- The accommodation in the roof space and roof has been redesigned.

The rest of this report has been updated to reflect the revised drawings submitted.

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 is proposed in the middle of the property and a first floor side extension added to the property. 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 redesigned 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 across the rear width of the property, now shown to be set in by 2.5m. 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 despite being redesigned a sizeable dormer extension being added to the side of the property. The dormer window on the flank elevation facing Inchwood has windows (6 in total) which have 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 proposed first floor development is still 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 proposed changes 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.

However, Members will need to consider whether the changes submitted overcome previous concerns.

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. It is however noted that the rear first floor extension has been amended and set in by 2.5m to reduce the impact to the neighbours at No.122. Despite this change the reduction of 2.5m at first floor level and the insertion of a large obscure glazed window on the flank elevation would still have an overbearing visual impact on the neighbours.

The increased bulk and mass to the property would mean the neighbours will be faced with looking at a large obscure glazed window and a 3m deep first floor side extension. 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 rear windows creating a greater degree of 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.

Whilst Members may consider that the changes to the dormer are now more acceptable the omission of the proposed en-suite at first floor level is not considered significant enough to overcome concerns about the development as a whole, which still represents an overdevelopment of the property and a visual impact to the residential amenities to No.122 by reason of its bulk, scale and depth, contrary to policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

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
as amended by documents received on 15.06.2017**

The reasons for refusal are:

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.

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.