

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

**Application No :** 17/03204/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Bromley Common And**  
**Keston**

**Address :** Woodside Barnet Wood Road Hayes  
Bromley BR2 8HJ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 541817 N: 165592

**Applicant :** Mrs Lorraine Fort

**Objections : YES**

### **Description of Development:**

Enlarge existing porch with wheelchair ramp to improve accessibility

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
Green Belt  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Smoke Control SCA 22

### **Proposal**

The application proposes an infill to an existing porch area, create a porch canopy and a disabled ramp make the property accessible via a wheelchair.

The application site hosts a two storey detached dwelling on the Southern side of Elmerside Road, Beckenham.

### **Consultations**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

### **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  
G1 Green Belt  
G4 Dwellings in the Green Belt or on MOL

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. The submission of the Draft Local Plan was made to Secretary of State on 11th August 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Policy 6 Housing Design  
Policy 37 General Design of Development  
Policy 49 The Green Belt  
Policy 51 Dwellings in the Green Belt or on MOL

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

#### Planning History

94/01377/FUL; Addition of first floor to bungalow; Permitted

94/02370/FUL; Two storey detached house; Permitted

94/02948/FUL; Single storey side extension for double garage; Refused

95/00402/FUL; Single storey side extension for double garage; Permitted

00/00847/FULL1; Front porch and single storey side and rear extensions; Refused

00/02233/FULL1; Front porch and single storey side and rear extension; Refused

#### **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 and the impact on the Green Belt.

#### Design

The properties on this part of the road are set back significantly from the highway however tend to have open plan frontages and as such any extensions to the front would be highly visible.

The design of the front porch would be sympathetic to the existing porch area and would replicate the existing roof profile. The materials used would also so far as practicable match the existing and this would help to maintain the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the street scene.

#### Residential Amenity and Impact on Adjoining Properties

The porch is very small creating only around 8m<sup>2</sup> additional floor space, as such it is considered that there would be no impact on the adjoining properties in terms of their outlook and amenity, especially given the distance between the properties on this stretch of the road.

## Green Belt

The property at present is a replacement dwelling which was approved under reference 94/02370 and it is clear that several alterations have been made to the property since this, some of which we do not have record of. It is estimated therefore that since the replacement dwelling was built an additional 73m<sup>2</sup> have been added to the property giving a percentage increase of 32%, the provision of the front porch would therefore create a total percentage increase of approximately 35.5%.

Part (i) of policy G4 states that extensions will only be permitted if the net increase is no more than 10%, whilst it is considered that the addition of a porch at the front would meet the other needs of Policy G4 in that the extension would not harm the visual amenities or the open and rural character of the locality nor would it result in significant detrimental change in the overall form, bulk or character of the original dwelling house, it is significantly over the permissible 10% and therefore it is considered that the extension would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This would accord with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Whilst it is noted that the applicant has provided details relating to the disabilities of the occupiers of the house and the need for the extension these do not constitute very special circumstances and therefore the application should be refused.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is unacceptable in that it would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref: 17/03204 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

## **RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED**

### **The reasons for refusal are:**

- 1 The proposed extension would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and be contrary to Policy G4 of the Unitary Development Plan regarding development, alterations or conversions in the Green Belt.**