

**Section '3' - Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT**

**Application No :** 17/04773/FULL6

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

**Address :** 98 Lower Gravel Road Bromley BR2 8LJ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 542775 N: 166292

**Applicant :** Mr Johnathan (Tyber) Cranstoun

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Roof alterations to accommodate a new bedroom and wash room. Alterations include increase ridge height, new rear dormer and roof lights.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Smoke Control SCA 22

**Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for roof alterations to accommodate a new bedroom and wash room. Alterations include an increased ridge height, new rear dormer and roof lights.

The proposal would result in the ridge of the roof being raised from max 2m to max 3.2m. The rear dormer is shown with 2 windows in the rear elevation.

**Location and Key Constraints**

The application dwelling is a detached house that sits on the Southern side of Lower Gravel Road.

The site does not lie within a conservation area and is not a Listed Building.

**Comments from Local Residents and Groups**

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

**Objections**

- The proposal would have an unacceptable impact on No.100 and No.96 in terms of loss of light and intrusion of privacy.
- The increased height would dwarf No.100
- There will be no side access for the scaffolding to go up.

- The property is overdeveloped and not in keeping with the rest of the street.
- The proposal would tower over opposite dwellings and reduce their sunlight.

#### Support

- The proposal should be allowed.
- Other houses have been allowed to have roof extensions
- The proposal would not affect the look of the street.

#### 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:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- 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
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies

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.in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

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

### **Planning History**

The relevant planning history relating to the application site is summarised as follows

02/00482/FULL1 - Increase height of roof and install front and rear dormers.  
Refused.

17/02004/FULL6 - Roof alterations to include increase in ridge height, rear dormer and roof lights, and insertion of first floor balcony at rear. Refused

### **Considerations**

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are: (delete or add as applicable)

- Resubmission
- Design
- Neighbouring amenity
- CIL

### Resubmission

Planning permission was previously refused and dismissed at appeal under application reference 02/00482/FULL1. The Inspector considered the dwelling to be a house of pleasing proportions with Georgian-style windows and a low hipped roof. He stated that the dwelling is rather different in appearance from the other, more typically suburban, houses in the vicinity and has a significantly higher ridge than no. 100, the immediately adjoining house to the east.

The proposal was for the reconstruction of the roof and raising its pitch to approx. 45 degrees and the formation of a dormer to the rear to provide additional accommodation within the roof.

The Inspector concluded that the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and be in conflict with planning policy.

More recently, permission was refused under application 17/02004/FULL6 for a similar proposal. However it showed a greater ridge height (3.6m compared with the current 3.2m), which also resulted in a steeper angled roof, and also included a discordant and incongruous design feature to the rear. It is of note that a small dormer already exists in the rear roof slope.

The current proposal shows a reduction in the maximum ridge height which would also reduce the angle of the roof pitch. It also shows a smaller dormer (3.5m in width compared with 4m) with standard fenestration rather than the incongruous first floor patio doors shown previously.

### Design

Design is a key consideration in the planning process. Good design is an important aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The NPPF states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

London Plan and UDP policies further reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality design.

Policy H8 of the UDP 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. This is reiterated in draft UDP policy 6.

The Council considers that the retention of space around residential buildings is essential to ensure adequate separation and to safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents. It is important to prevent a cramped appearance and unrelated terracing from occurring. It is also necessary to protect the high spatial standards and level of visual amenity which characterise many of the Borough's residential areas.

The Council will normally expect the design of residential extensions to blend with the style and materials of the main building. Where possible, the extension should incorporate a pitched roof and include a sympathetic roof design and materials.

It was considered previously that the increase in ridge height would spoil the proportions of the existing house, making it appear top-heavy. The house, with its much larger roof, would appear over-dominant in the street scene and, in particular, would loom over no. 100. The shape of the large rear dormer and the small misplaced windows within it would appear out of proportion with the

proposed roof slope and rear fenestration, would appear as a disharmonious addition to the dwelling, and add to the visual harm caused by the enlarged roof. In addition, the proposed rear patio doors at first floor level would appear as an incongruous feature owing to their overlap with the eaves of the main roof and would cause further visual harm to the appearance of the rear elevation of the rear of the dwelling.

In comparison with the recently refused scheme, the ridge of the roof has been reduced which also reduces the pitch of the roof slope. Although it would still be 1.2m higher than existing, the combination of the reduced pitch and reduction in height (compared with that considered previously) would largely address the previous concern about the resultant appearance of the roof within the streetscene. In light of the previous appeal decision, extensive consideration has been given to the relative heights of the application dwelling and the neighbouring dwellings. The current proposed increase in height of the roof would not appear as top heavy and would not have a significant enough impact on the overall appearance of the dwelling, or its appearance within the context of the neighbouring dwellings to warrant its refusal. It would appear as higher than No.100 but this is not considered to be so excessive to justify refusal. The overall expression of the roof would appear proportionate to the house and, taking account of the existing differences between the application site and neighbouring buildings, would not have an adverse impact on the character of the surrounding area.

The undesirable fenestration as shown in the refused scheme has been removed from the current proposal, and the dormer is shown with standard windows as would be expected within such a setting. This element of the proposal is considered unobjectionable and would not be out of keeping within its residential context.

### Neighbouring amenity

Policy BE1 of the UDP seeks to protect existing residential occupiers from inappropriate development. Issues to consider are the impact of a development proposal upon neighbouring properties by way of overshadowing, loss of light, overbearing impact, overlooking, loss of privacy and general noise and disturbance.

As previously considered, due to the orientation of the building, with the gardens facing South / south-west, and the slope of the roof away from neighbouring occupiers, the increase in height would not have a significant additional detrimental impact on sunlight reaching the gardens of neighbouring occupiers or neighbouring dwellings.

The side rooflights would face at an upwards diagonal angle to either side of the house, and as such would have no detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity.

The windows within the dormer, would only replicate existing fenestration in the rear of the dwelling, and as such would have no addition overlooking impact.

The previously proposed balcony has been removed.

## CIL

The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is not payable on this application.

## Conclusion

Having had regard to the above it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable as it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents or impact detrimentally on the character of the area or the existing dwelling.

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

It is recommended that permission be granted.

## **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

**1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

**REASON: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

**2 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.**

**REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.**

**3 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.**