

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

Application No : 17/05010/FULL6

Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall

Address : 62 Chestnut Avenue West Wickham
BR4 9ES

OS Grid Ref: E: 539445 N: 164753

Applicant : Mr scott hayhoe

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Frist floor side extension, small part hipped/part flat roof to the remaining flat roof area on the existing side extension and addition of a small dummy pitch roof to the rear ground floor extension on the existing flat roof

Key designations:

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

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a proposed first floor side extension, construction of a hipped roof over the existing side extension and addition of a dummy pitch roof to the rear ground floor extension.

The proposed first floor extension will have a height to the hipped roof of 5.6m, a depth of 6.7m and a width of 2.2m. The hipped roof to the existing side extension at ground floor level will have a height of 3.595m. Whilst the rear dummy pitched roof will have an overall height of approximately 3.4m.

Location and Key Constraints

The application site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the north side of Chestnut Avenue, West Wickham. The surrounding area is characterised by similar semi-detached dwellings, many of which have been extended at ground and first floor level along the flank elevation.

Comments from Local Residents and Groups

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

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

H9 Side space

BE1 Design of new development

Draft Local Plan

6 Residential Extensions

8 Side Space

37 General Design of Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1 - General Design Principles
SPG2 - Residential Design Guidance

Planning History

None

Considerations

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- Design
- Neighbouring amenity

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. Policies BE1 and H8 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. 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.

Furthermore, Policy H9 of the UDP and Draft Policy 8 of Bromley's emerging Local Plan requires planning proposals for two or more storeys in height, including first floor extensions to retain a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary for the full height and depth of the proposal.

The proposal would fail to incorporate a side space at ground floor level as the existing single storey side extension has been extended to the boundary line. The proposal would however incorporate a side space of 1.5m at first floor level, which would exceed the minimum required in Policy H9. The street consists predominately of semi-detached houses, many of which have been extended and altered along the side elevation at ground and first floor level.

Policy H9 of the UDP outlines (in part):

'When considering applications for new residential development, including extensions, the Council will normally require the following:

(i) for a proposal of two or more storeys in height, a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site should be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building;'

This policy seeks to ensure '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.'

It is noted that, the presence of the term 'normally' in the body of UDP policy H9 implies, a need for discretion in the application of the policy having regard to several factors including the characteristics of the site and its surroundings, the precise nature of the proposal and the objectives of the policy as set out in the explanatory text. The property is situated on a corner plot and will incorporate a side space of approximately 1.5m at first floor level. As such, the proposal is not anticipated to appear cramped or lead to any unrelated terracing from occurring.

Taking the above into account, the development is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the spatial standards and visual amenities of the surrounding area when considering the layout and siting of the property, and the relationship with neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the design of the extension, in particular the subservient hipped roof, would complement the character and appearance of the host dwelling and adjoining properties. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the policy objectives of Policies H9, BE1 and H8 of the UDP, Draft Local Plan policies, London Plan and the NPPF.

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. This is supported by London Plan Policy 7.6.

Having had regard to the layout and siting of the host dwelling the proposed first floor extension and alterations to the roof of the side extension mean the extensions would not adversely impact neighbouring residents.

The proposal also includes the addition of a 'dummy pitch roof' to the rear ground floor extension. This will increase the height of the rear extension from 3.2m to approximately 3.4m. Considering the modest increase to the height of the rear extension the proposal is not expected to cause any significant loss of amenity with particular regard to light, outlook or prospect to the adjoining neighbouring property at No.60.

Conclusion

Taking into account the above, Members may therefore consider that the development in the manner proposed is on balance acceptable. Whilst it is acknowledged that a 1 metre side space is not provided for the full height and depth of the proposal, the layout and siting of the host dwelling and the subsequent extensions would not appear cramped or lead to a terracing affect. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would not be in conflict with the policy objectives of H9 or Draft Policy 8.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 17/05010/FULL6 and any other applications on the site set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

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.