

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

**Application No :** 18/01865/FULL6

**Ward:**  
Kelsey And Eden Park

**Address :** 72 Lloyds Way, Beckenham BR3 3QS

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 536714 N: 167771

**Applicant :** Mr & Mrs Geffen

**Objections :** NO

**Description of Development:**

First floor side extension

**Key designations:**

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

**Proposal**

The application seeks permission for a first floor side extension with a width of 3.1m and a depth of approx. 6.7m, sited above the existing single storey side element of the property. The extension would project off the side of the existing two storey element and would sit behind the existing pitched roof at single storey level to the front of the dwelling. The extension would have a hipped roof to match the ridge height and eaves height of the existing dwelling.

**Location and Key Constraints**

The application site hosts a two storey end of terrace dwelling located on the southern side of Lloyd Way, Beckenham.

**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 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

#### 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**

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

- 02/00745/FULL1 - Single storey side and front extension - Permitted 17.04.2002

## **Considerations**

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

- Design
- Neighbouring amenity
- CIL

### 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 extension is not considered excessive in its width and the roof would provide a continuation of the existing ridge and eaves height to appear in keeping with the host dwelling. The extension is sympathetically designed to complement the host building with the first floor extension set behind the existing pitched roof to the single storey element at the front of the property and the proposed materials to match the existing. As such the extension would not appear overly bulky or dominant within the street scene, and would not detract from the character and appearance of the area in general.

### Side Space

Policy H9 requires a minimum of 1m side space to be provided for proposals of two or more storeys in height, and this should be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall or building. Furthermore, where higher standards of separation exist proposals are expected to provide a more generous side space.

The first floor extension would be sited above the existing single storey side element of the property which abuts the boundary, and would sit flush with its flank wall resulting in the first floor extension also abutting the flank boundary of the site.

The dwelling forms an end of terrace property at the eastern end of Lloyds Way. Its flank boundary adjoins a public footpath accessed via a gate adjoining No.72,

which separates the host dwelling from the rear boundaries of properties facing onto Stanhope Grove. There would be a significant distance between the rear of the properties at Stanhope Grove, and the public footpath has a width of 1m which would further separation to a similar width as normally expected by policy H9.

Whilst the development would not provide a minimum side space of 1m the proposal would not result in a terracing effect between the extension and any neighbouring property and the proposed extension would also not cause a cramped appearance within the wider streetscene. It is therefore considered no significant harm to the spatial standards or visual amenities of the streetscene would occur and that proposal does not conflict with the reason for the side space policy and as such is compatible.

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.

In terms of the impact on neighbouring dwellings, the extension would not project beyond the front or rear and would not be visible from the adjoining dwelling at No.70. There would be a significant separation distance to other nearby properties to the front, flank and rear of the site, and it is therefore considered the extension would not result in any significant harm by way of loss of light or outlook to these neighbours.

The proposed flank elevation of the extension would be blank and therefore would not result in overlooking or a loss of privacy to properties facing Stanhope Grove, though a condition to prevent the addition of any windows in the flank elevation at first floor level is recommended to protect the privacy of these neighbours. Furthermore, the addition of windows in the front and rear elevation of the extension would not result in any significant opportunities for overlooking above that which already exist.

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

### CIL

The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is not payable on this application and the applicant has completed the relevant form.

## **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.

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:** 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.

- 4** No windows or doors shall at any time be inserted in the first floor flank elevation(s) of the extension hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

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