

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

**Application No :** 18/02884/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Hayes And Coney Hall**

**Address :** 3 Glebe House Drive Hayes Bromley BR2  
7BN

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 540700 N: 166097

**Applicant :** Mr Paul Schmitt Brookes

**Objections : No**

**Description of Development:**

First Floor side extension, loft conversion and roof alterations to include rear dormer

**Key designations:**

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Open Space Deficiency  
Smoke Control SCA 51

**Proposal**

The application proposes the following extensions:

- First floor extension over existing study room and kitchen

The proposed first floor extension would be positioned above the existing ground floor of the house which lies 0.75m from the flank boundary. The extension would measure 7.3m long; 3.6m wide to the front and 3m wide to the rear elevations. It would project 0.6m in front of the front wall of the dwelling.

The extension would incorporate a hipped roof to complement the existing roof slope with a subservient ridgeline.

- Roof alterations

The proposed rear dormer extension would have a width of 4.9m and a flat roof with a height of 3m. Three windows are proposed within the rear of the dormer. One rooflight would be provided on the front and one on side elevations. The dormer and existing roof space are proposed to provide a new bedroom within the roof space.

**Location and Key Constraints**

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the western side of Glebe House Drive, close to the junction with Hayes Wood Avenue. The host dwelling has a prominent front gable feature shared with the adjoining semi-detached dwelling, with a staggered front elevation incorporating a two storey set-back with a porthole feature window. There is a single storey side extension which projects 0.6m in the front wall of the dwelling (planning ref: 12/02119).

The surrounding area is residential, characterised by semi-detached dwellings. The property does not lie within a conservation area or any area with special designation and is not listed.

### **Comments from Local Residents and Groups**

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

### **Comments from Consultees**

No consultees were contacted for comment on the application.

### **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.

The National Planning Policy Framework was published on 24th July 2018. According to paragraph 48 of the NPPF decision takers can also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

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

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. The submission of the Draft Local Plan was subject to Hearings in 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:

12/02119/FULL6 - Single storey front/side extension replacement roof to existing extension - 28.08.2012 (Permitted)

### **Considerations**

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

- o Design
- o Side Space
- o Neighbouring amenity
- o 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.

Policies BE1, H8 and H9 are relevant to this application. Policy BE1 states that development proposals will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout and should be attractive to look at, complementing the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. Policy H8 requires that the design including the scale, form and materials of construction should respect or complement the host dwelling, being compatible with development in the surrounding area. Policy H9 states that the Council will normally require a minimum of 1m side space from the side boundary of the site to be retained in the case of a proposal two or more storeys in height.

The proposed first floor side extension would infill the existing ground floor side extension and would maintain a separation of 0.75m from the south side boundary. Having considered that No. 1 is a triangular-plot and the host dwelling is some distance away from the application dwelling, it is considered that the proposal has a modest depth which would not be considered to overdevelop the site. Furthermore, the height and design of the roof would help ensure that the extension remains subservient, and it is shown to be finished with materials to match the ground floor front elevation of the existing dwelling.

The extension would be highly visible within the street scene. The first floor extension would alter the front elevation and it would retain the prominent front gable as the principle feature of the pair of dwellings. It is considered that the proposed first floor extension, together with the existing side storey extension, which would project 0.6m forward from the original dwelling, is considered acceptable and it would enhance the appearance of the front elevation of the property.

With regards to the impact on the adjoining semi-detached property, No. 5, these semi-detached properties do not benefit from symmetrical pitched roofs as No. 5 has a side

dormer extension. However, it appears that the side dormer at No.5 does not have any planning permission and currently it is under investigation whether any enforcement action should be taken. Nevertheless, it is considered that the side dormer extension at No.5 and the proposal still retain a degree of subservience to the host dwelling as a consequence of the retention of the prominent front gable as the principle feature of the pair of dwellings. Whilst the proposal would result in an element of unbalancing, there are similar semi-detached properties in Glebe House Drive, such as No. 7 and 9, therefore it is considered the proposal does not result in any significant impact on the character or appearance of those semi-detached properties in the area.

The proposed dormer is set up from the eaves and would sit below the ridge of the main roof. Given the size of the application property, it would remain adequately subservient. There are similar dormer extensions at No. 5 and No. 7.

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

### 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 normally 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.

For information, members should be aware that a recent appeal was allowed at No.14 Hayes Wood Avenue (planning ref: 17/03333) for a first floor side extension and conversion of garage into habitable room. The proposal incorporates an extension which extended along the full length of the property, and is 0.2m from the boundary with No. 16 Hayes Wood Avenue. In this particular appeal, the Inspector stated that:

"the specific disposition of the appeal property on its site and angled relationship with the neighbouring dwelling at No.16 Hayes Wood Avenue on the inside bend, makes the prospect of the introduction of a cramped appearance to the development, or a terracing effect in the future highly unlikely. .... I am satisfied that the proposed development would not result in a cramped form of the development or have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the street scene and area. In this respect I have not found the proposals to conflict with saved Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the UDP."

In this proposal, the proposed first floor side extension would provide a side space of 0.75m and it would not provide a minimum side space of 1m. Given that there is a considerable distance to the other property adjoining this boundary with No. 3 Glebe House Drive, the proposal would not result in a terracing effect and cause a cramped appearance within the wider streetscene. Therefore, the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact to the spatial standards of the area. As such, it is considered that the proposal does not conflict with the reason for the side space policy and as such is compatible.

### 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.

The proposal is 0.75m away from the shared boundary with No. 1. This is set immediately adjacent to a detached garage located on the neighbouring property. It is noted that No. 1 sits in a triangular plot and the neighbouring dwelling is some 10m away from the application site. A window on the first floor flank wall and a rooflight are proposed on the side elevation. Give that the first floor window would be obscure glazed and the rooflight is only a relocation of the existing side rooflight, it is considered the proposed extension would not impact on the amenities of this neighbouring property with regards to loss of light, outlook or visual amenity.

With regards to the neighbouring property to the north, No.5, the proposed side extension would not be visible from No. 5 as the proposal would not project beyond the existing first floor rear elevation. Therefore, it would not have any detrimental amenities impact on No.5.

With regards to overlooking issues, it is noted there is already a certain degree of mutual overlooking that currently exists from the upper windows of the properties and therefore, it is not considered that the proposed dormer and the rooflights would cause such significant loss of privacy as to warrant a refusal on this basis.

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

Subject to the imposition of conditions regarding the use and retention of obscure glazing to the first floor side window, it is considered that an unacceptable loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings would not 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.

**as amended by documents received on 06.08.2018**

**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 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 UDP and in the interests of visual and residential amenity.**

- 3 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and / or drawings unless otherwise 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 appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.**

- 4 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed first floor window in the southern flank elevation shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy Level 3 and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and the window shall subsequently be permanently retained in accordance as such.**

**Reason: In the interests of the amenities of nearby residential properties and to accord with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan**

- 5 No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the flank elevations 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**