

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 17/04402/FULL6

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 58 Queensway West Wickham BR4 9ER

OS Grid Ref: E: 539519 N: 164957

Applicant : Mr Samuel Ebohon

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Roof alterations to incorporate side/ rear dormer.

Key designations:

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

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for roof alterations to incorporate side/ rear dormer. The dormer will extend across the side of the main roof of the dwelling before wrapping around to extend across the rear roof slope. It will have a flat roof with hipped element to the side and will be tile hung to match the existing roof. It will contain two windows within the rear elevation and two windows in the side elevation.

Location and Key Constraints

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Queensway, West Wickham. The property includes a prominent front gable, with a staggered flank elevation. The surrounding area is characterised by two-storey semi-detached residential dwellings of a similar style, many of which maintain their original roof profiles. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it Listed.

Consultations

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

Any further comments received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Planning Considerations

Policy Context

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

According to paragraph 216 of the NPPF decision takers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- o The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- o The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- o The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

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.

The development plan for Bromley comprises the Bromley UDP (July 2006), the London Plan (March 2016) and the Emerging Local Plan (2016). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies:

London Plan Policies

7.4 Local character

7.6 Architecture

Unitary Development Plan

H8 Residential extensions

BE1 Design of new development

Draft Local Plan

6 Residential Extensions

37 General Design of Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1 - General Design Principles

SPG2 - Residential Design Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is also a material consideration.

Planning History

Under ref: 85/02766/FUL, planning permission was granted for a single storey rear extension.

Under ref: 90/02401/FUL, planning permission was granted for a single storey side extension.

More recently, under ref: 17/01665/FULL6, planning permission was refused for roof alterations to incorporate side/ rear dormer for the following reason;

"1 The proposed roof alterations, involving substantial alterations to the existing roof profile of the property, are unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and would result in top-heavy and incongruous additions, detrimental to

the appearance of the host dwelling and resulting in severe unbalancing to the symmetry of the pair of semi's, causing adverse harm to the character of the streetscene and wider area in general, and thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan."

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.

Design and Scale

Both national and local planning policies recognise the importance of local distinctiveness in ensuring an effective planning system which achieves favourable design. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness, whilst paragraph 61 refers to the fact that although visual appearance and architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations. Whilst London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 seek to enhance local context and character, as well as encouraging high quality design in assessing the overall acceptability of a proposal. It is considered that the proposal fails to address these criteria.

Similarly, policy BE1 of the UDP set out a number of criteria for the design of new development. With regard to local character and appearance development should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas.

Moreover, UDP policy H8 provides that dormer windows should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches, unless dormers are a feature of the area.

Queensway and the surrounding area is characterised by uniformly sited and symmetrically designed semi-detached dwellings. The roofs of the dwellings are both prominent and of particular importance to the appearance of the street scene and comprise large front gables with timber detailing to the front and full hips to the sides and rear. These hips add to the sense of space between the buildings and emphasise the prominence of the front gables. The properties also benefit from two storey wings to the side which are modest in form and appearance with fully hipped roofs set back from the front of the property. As a result they are visually subservient and emphasise the simplicity and prominence of the front gables. Whilst it is noted that some properties in the area have been extended, this original roof design remains an evident feature of the area.

The application property is one half of a pair of one of these semi-detached dwellings. Both the application property and its adjoining semi benefit from unaltered roofs which maintain the original large front gables and full hips to the side and rear as well as the secondary hipped roof to the two storey wing.

The application follows a previously refused application, under ref: 17/01665/FULL6, for a larger side and rear dormer which extended across both the main roof and the secondary roof of the two storey side wing. This application was refused as it was considered that the proposed roof development would substantially alter the existing roof profile of the property and would be unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling, resulting in a top-heavy and incongruous addition which would be detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling and result in severe unbalancing to the symmetry of the pair of semi's, therefore adversely harmful to the character of the streetscene and wider area in general.

The roof alterations proposed under this current application include a smaller side and rear dormer which would project only across the side and rear of the main roof and not across the secondary roof to the side. In addition, the dormer has been reduced in height so that the flat roof of the dormer would sit around 1m lower than the ridge height of the main roof and would include a small side hipped element.

It is acknowledged that the dormer proposed under this current application would be smaller and less bulky than that of the previously refused application. However, it would still occupy much of the existing main side roof slope wrapping around across the rear roof slope. As such, the dormer would still be highly visible and prominent when viewed from the street scene and would significantly alter the appearance of the host dwelling.

Whilst it is clear that each case must be treated on its individual merits, it should also be noted that many of the recent applications in the surrounding area which have proposed similar side/rear dormer extensions have been refused due to their size and prominent location and the resultant impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene in general. A number of these applications (including one at no. 115 Queensway (ref: 16/01620) as well as in neighbouring Birch Tree Avenue, including no.'s 42 and 138 Birch Tree Avenue (ref's 16/03903 and 15/04448 respectively)) have also been dismissed at appeal.

In the dismissing of the appeals of all three of these nearby applications, the Planning Inspectorate outlined that despite the presence of existing extensions in the surrounding locality almost all these were considered to detract from the character and appearance of their host properties and the street scene. Furthermore, it was determined that dormer extensions upset the rhythm of the roofscape and failed to respect the character and appearance of the host dwellings.

Therefore, for the reasons above, Members may consider that the reduction in scale of the proposed dormer is not significant enough overcome the previous reason for refusal and that the proposed roof extension would still undermine and detract from the character and symmetry of the pair of dwellings resulting in harm to the overall character and appearance of the street scene.

Impact on Residential 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. This is supported by London Plan Policy 7.6 and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

In respect to residential amenity, the proposal is not considered to result in any loss of light or outlook. The rear facing windows are not considered to provide any additional opportunities for overlooking than currently exist from the upper first floor window of the property. One of the flank windows would serve a 'passage' between the two new bedrooms and as such could be required to be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking towards no. 60. The other window would be the only window serving a bedroom and as such it would not be considered reasonable to require it to be obscure. Having visited the site there are no flank windows within the neighbouring dwelling at no. 60 which face the site and as such in this instance, whilst not ideal, the clear glazed window may be considered acceptable in that it would not result in any undue loss of privacy to this neighbouring residential dwelling.

Summary

Taking into account all the above, Members may consider that the proposed side and rear dormer would result in detrimental harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and pair of semi's, and would unacceptably upset the balance and sense of rhythm within the streetscene, and therefore contrary to the policy objectives of Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan, London Plan 7.4 and 7.6 and the NPPF.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed alterations incorporating the construction of a side and rear dormer, are unsympathetic to the scale and form of the host dwelling and would result in top-heavy and incongruous addition, detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling and resulting in severe unbalancing to the symmetry of the pair of semi's, causing adverse harm to the character of the streetscene and wider area in general, and thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan, London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.6 and the National Planning Policy Framework.**