

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

Application No : 18/01102/FULL6

**Ward:
Bromley Common And
Keston**

**Address : Morven Heathfield Road Keston BR2
6BB**

OS Grid Ref: E: 541485 N: 164254

Applicant : Mr And Mrs Cox

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey rear extension, single storey front extension and side dormer to first floor

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Keston Village
Areas of Archeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 22

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a part one/two storey rear extension, single storey front extension, side dormer to first floor and elevational alterations.

The proposed rear extension will project 4.5m in depth with the ground floor extending 12.3m along the rear of the existing dwelling. The first floor will be set back by 0.4m from the north-western flank wall and extend for a width of 6.2m across the rear. The two storey part of the proposed rear extension will have an "M" shaped roof with a ridge height of 7.1m and eaves height to match the main roof of the existing dwelling. The remaining single storey rear element will have a flat roof with a height of 3.0m and will contain one pyramid rooflight.

The proposed single storey front extension will project 1m forward of the existing garage for a width of 3.1m. It will have a dual-pitched roof and will include a window within the front elevation. The existing garage is shown to be converted into habitable space as a result of the extension.

The proposed side dormer will be located to the south-eastern side roof slope. It will have a small pitched roof and will contain a window within the flank elevation. The proposed extensions are shown to be finished with brickwork, plain tiles and windows to match the existing.

The elevational alterations consist of two windows to the ground floor and one window to the first floor north west side, one rooflight to rear roof slope and a door and window to ground floor south east side elevation.

Location

The application site comprises a two storey detached dwellinghouse located on the north-eastern side of Heathfield Road, Keston, on the corner with Greys Park Close. The property is located on the edge of the Keston Village Conservation Area.

Comments from Local Residents and Groups

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

Comments from Consultees

Conservation Officer: Application has made a reduction in depth and dropped the ridge of the rear extension so the impact on the CA has been lessened to an acceptable limit. If minded to recommend permission please condition external materials with C01.

APCA: No objection in principle subject to the size of the dormer which should be reduced.

Highways: No objection to the application.

Trees: The application site is located within the conservation area and therefore applies protection to trees meeting the dimension requirements. Trees are limited to the front of the site and will not be at risk as a result of this proposal. The side and rear of the plot are bounded by mixed species hedging and shrubs. The application will result in a loss of shrubs to the rear and will bring the overall scale of the dwelling closer to the rear boundary. Due to the management of the trees here as a hedge, there are no restrictions to trees at the rear.

A loss of useful amenity space in the rear garden is foreseeable in the event that planning permission is granted. No objections are made on this occasion and no tree related conditions are considered necessary.

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 subject to an Examination In Public which commenced on 4th December 2017 and the Inspector's report is awaited. 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

7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology

Unitary Development Plan

H8 Residential extensions

BE1 Design of new development

BE11 Conservation Areas

BE14 Trees in Conservation Areas

T3 Parking

Draft Local Plan

6 Residential Extensions

30 Parking

37 General Design of Development

41 Conservation Areas

43 Trees in Conservation Areas

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1 - General Design Principles
SPG2 - Residential Design Guidance
SPG - Keston Village Conservation Area

Planning History

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

17/03660/FULL6 - Part one/two storey rear extension, single storey front extension and side dormer to first floor - Application refused.

Reason for refusal - The proposed part one/two storey rear extension, by reason of its excessive depth, height and massing, and its prominent location on a corner plot, would result in a dominant and bulky overdevelopment of the site, which fails to be subservient and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the visual amenities of the streetscene, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Keston Village Conservation Area, thereby contrary to Policies H8, BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Considerations

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

- Resubmission
- Principle
- Design
- Neighbouring amenity
- Heritage Impact

Resubmission

This planning application follows the refusal of planning application ref. 17/03660/FULL6. The main differences can be summarized as follows:

The ridge and roof shape of the two storey rear extension has been reduced so that it sits below the existing roof ridge height. This element of the rear extension has been reduced in depth from 5.0m to 4.5m and set in by 0.4m so that it no longer extends the full width of the existing property. The second storey element of the rear extension has also been reduced in width from 6.3m to 6.2m.

Principle

Under the previously submitted planning application it was established that the proposed side dormer and front extension would be considered acceptable in principle. It was considered that the proposed side dormer would be subservient in scale and design and would preserve the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the wider Conservation Area within which it lies. No issue was

raised with regards to the proposed front extension which was also considered by the Council's Conservation Officer to be quite modest and acceptable in Conservation Area terms subject to a matching material condition.

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.

The proposed two storey rear extension will project 4.5m in depth and will be set back by 0.4m from the existing north-western flank wall. It is proposed that the roof will sit below the existing ridge line by 0.7m and pitch down to be level with the existing eaves. As part of the previous application it was considered that the scale and massing of the proposed extensions would result in a development which is not subservient to the existing dwelling and the bulk created by such a large expanse of roof along with the 5m deep flank wall would appear overly dominant when viewed from Greys Park Close.

It is considered that the reduction of the ridge height and depth of the rear extension, along with the stepping in of the flank wall and reduction in width of the second storey element, reduces the impact of the extension. As a result the proposed scale and massing of the extension would not appear overly dominant when viewed from Greys Park Close. The proposed depth and height of the extension would be subservient to the main dwelling and not overdevelop the site as a whole. The proposed materials will match those of the existing dwelling which will be complementary and compatible with the application site and developments in the surrounding area.

Having regard to the form, scale, siting and proposed materials it is considered that the proposed extension would complement the host property and would not appear out of character with surrounding development or the area generally.

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 part of the previous planning application it was considered that there would be no loss of light, outlook, privacy or undue harm caused to the amenities to No. 67 Heathfield Road or No.13 Greys Park Close as a result of the proposed

development. The amended plans reduce the height and depth of the proposed development with the side dormer and front porch remaining as previously proposed. There are several elevational alterations such as a change in the style and location of the windows facing No.67. Taking into consideration that No.67 sits further back in its plot than the host dwelling and that the property does not benefit from any windows in its flank elevation, it is considered that none of the proposed amendments would result in a loss of residential amenity to the adjoining neighbours.

Having regard to the scale and siting of the development, it is not considered that a significant loss of amenity with particular regard to light, outlook, prospect and privacy would arise.

Heritage Impact

Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a requirement on a local planning authority in relation to development in a Conservation Area, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.

Interpretation of the 1990 Act in law has concluded that preserving the character of the Conservation Area can not only be accomplished through positive contribution but also through development that leaves the character or appearance of the area unharmed.

The NPPF also states that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets (para.132).

Policy BE11 of the UDP seeks to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas and in particular sets out that an alteration or extension to a building within a conservation area will be expected to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of the existing building and space.

As set out above, the proposed amendments which have been made are considered sufficient to overcome the previous reasons for refusal. As a result of these proposed amendments it is considered that the extensions would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The Council's Conservation Officer has not raised an objection to the application and has stated that reduction in depth and dropping of the ridge of the rear extension has lessened the impact on the Conservation Area to an acceptable limit.

Trees

The host dwelling is situated in the Keston Village Conservation Area and so it is necessary to assess what impact the development may have on the trees situated close to the application site. The side and rear of the plot are bounded by mixed species hedging and shrubs. The Council's Tree Officer has advised that based on the proposed plans no objections are made and no tree related conditions would be considered necessary.

Highways

The NPPF recognises that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. The NPPF clearly states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

London Plan and UDP Policies encourage sustainable transport modes whilst recognising the need for appropriate parking provision. Car parking standards within the London Plan, UDP and emerging draft Local Plan should be used as a basis for assessment.

It is considered that there would be sufficient space within the curtilage of the site for vehicle parking and that the loss of the garage would not have a detrimental impact on parking within the local area. The Council's Highways Officer has raised no objection to the development.

Conclusion

Having had regard to the above it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area, and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

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.

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: To comply with Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Details (including samples) of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

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.