

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 18/03136/FULL6

Ward:
West Wickham

Address : 77 The Crescent West Wickham BR4
0HD

OS Grid Ref: E: 539180 N: 167141

Applicant : Michael Williams

Description of Development:

First floor front side extension and hip to gable roof with rear dormer

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 2

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a first floor front side extension and new hip roof above with high level barn end dormer and loft conversion with flat roof rear dormer. The property already benefits from a first floor side extension which was granted planning permission in 2001. It is proposed to increase the ridge height of the existing first floor side extension by 0.8m and bring the existing first floor extension forward by 2.2m so it is flush with the front building of the property. A new hip end style roof is proposed along with two new rooflights to be installed into the front roofslope. The first floor front extension would sit above the ridge of the existing garage.

The ridge height would also be increased by 0.8m to facilitate a rear dormer extension and to create two bedrooms. Two windows would be inserted into the dormer extension to serve the bedroom and bathroom. A high level dormer style window is proposed in the flank elevation which will provide light into the newly proposed staircase.

Materials are indicated to match the existing house.

Location and Key Constraints

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property located on the eastern side of The Crescent, West Wickham. Properties in the area are primarily residential in nature and are of a similar architectural style.

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

- Concerned how the development will affect our light (particularly when the sun is low in the winter - the sun rises from that direction), as the new hip end and side dormer will be as high as the main part of the roof and extend even further out.
- We are not sure whether it could affect our privacy as well, as the two velux windows will look out onto the front of our property (although we realise that they are angled with the roof).
- All of the semi-detached properties in this road are of a modest size and look fairly similar – even those with extensions. However this proposal does appear to be much bigger and will quite possibly look out of place, changing the appearance and character of the road.
- The development will be overbearing and top heavy
- Adversely affect the character and appearance of The Crescent.
- The two semi-detached properties' are set within a modest plot and the extension to increase the height and bulk of the existing first floor extension and into the roof space of 77 too large for the type of property.
- The proposal would unbalance the symmetrical appearance including the unsightly gable-end.
- A proportion of light will be reduced.

Comments from Consultees

No consultee comments required

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 from 4th December 2017 and the Inspectors 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

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space

Emerging Local Plan

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions
Draft Policy 8 Side Space
Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 - General Design Principles
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 – Residential Design Guidance

Planning History

Under planning application ref:- 18/00819/FULL6 planning permission was refused for first floor front side extension and hip to gable roof with rear dormer. The reason for refusal read as follows:-

The proposed first floor side extension and roof alterations, including the rear dormer extension, by reason of its design, prominent siting, scale and mass would constitute an overbearing and top heavy form of development and would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the host and adjoining dwelling contrary Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and SPG 1 General Design Principles & SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance and Policies 6 & 37 of the Draft Unitary Development Plan.

Under planning application ref:-01/01727/FULL1 planning permission was granted for first floor/two storey side/rear extension.

Under planning application ref:- 98/00806/FUL planning permission was granted for a single storey side/rear extension.

Considerations

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

- Resubmission
- Design
- Neighbouring amenity
- CIL

Resubmission

Under planning application ref:- 18/00819/FULL6 planning permission was refused for first floor front side extension and hip to gable roof with rear dormer.

The reason for refusal stated:-

The proposed first floor side extension and roof alterations, including the rear dormer extension, by reason of its design, prominent siting, scale and mass would constitute an overbearing and top heavy form of development and would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the host and adjoining dwelling contrary Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and SPG 1 General Design Principles & SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance and Policies 6 & 37 of the Draft Unitary Development Plan.

Following the refusal of the previous application the drawings have been amended with the following changes:-

- The half hip roof arrangement has been omitted.
- The ridge height of the existing first floor side extension will be increased by 0.8m
- Two front rooflights are proposed instead of four
- A high end side dormer has been added
- The rear dormer extension has been reduced in width
- Two bedrooms are now proposed in the loft space instead of three.

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.

The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to undertake a design critique of planning proposals to ensure that developments would function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Proposals must establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit; optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses and support local facilities and transport networks. Developments are required to respond to local character and history, and

reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation. New development must create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

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

The host property is a semi-detached property set within a modest plot and the extension to increase the height and bulk of the existing first floor extension and into the roof.

Policy BE1 of the UDP requires new buildings to complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas, and seeks to protect the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Policy H8 of the UDP requires residential extensions to blend with the style and materials of the host dwelling, and ensure that spaces or gaps between buildings are respected where these contribute to the character of the area.

Policy H9 of the UDP requires applications for new residential development, including extensions to retain, for a proposal of two or more storeys in height, a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building or where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space.

Supplementary Planning Guidance indicates the importance of retaining the architectural integrity of the host dwelling, with extensions being required to respect the buildings composition, especially the roof and rhythm of form.

As a semi-detached property it is important to consider whether the proposal would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings or appear unduly bulky and top heavy in the context of the host dwelling. The existing side extension is considered subservient from the host dwelling because it is recessed from the front building line and the ridge height is set at a lower ridge height. The revised drawings show the existing hipped roof would be increase in height by 0.8m to the same height as the host property and the existing first floor side extension would come forward by 2.2m, bringing it flush with the main dwellinghouse. This would increase the size of the existing study on the first floor.

The increase to the ridge height of the existing first floor side will add bulk to the overall appearance of the property. Considered in the context of the neighbouring semi-detached property No.79 it would unbalance the symmetrical appearance of the host property and that of the neighbour at No.79 although some unbalancing does already exist because No.79 does not have a two storey side extension. The proposal to increase the height of the side extension and the depth of the first floor study coupled with the changes to the roof may be considered acceptable as the hip roof arrangement will remain and bring the first floor front extension forward would not appear to dissimilar to the property opposite, No.60. The ridge height of the first floor extension at No.60 has however not been raised and does remain some subservience as an extension, the extension at No.77 would not have this.

Properties along this part of the road are by no means of uniform design and, on balance; it is considered that the roof design would not appear wholly out of character with the surrounding

area with the hipped roof arrangement being maintained to not look unsymmetrical when compared with the neighbouring at No.79.

The rear element of the proposal to build a dormer extension would add bulk, mass and scale to the rear of the property. The ridge height of the existing extension would be increased to facilitate the rear dormer element. The rear dormer would wrap around to the side and include a high level window to facilitate light into the landing area of the proposed new loft. Examples of side dormers are present along the road with the closest being at No.58.

Having regard to the form, scale, sitting and proposed materials it is considered that the proposed additions to the property would not result in a detrimental impact on the pair of semi-detached properties, the spatial standards and visual amenity of the character of the area.

Neighbouring amenity

Policy BE1 of the UDP and Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 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.

It is considered that the neighbouring properties at Nos. 79 and 75 would not be unduly affected as a result of the development. It is considered that the existing and proposed space and gaps between both properties would preserve their amenities. One new high level window is proposed in the flank elevation which would overlook the flank elevation of No.75 but this serves a landing so no overlooking or loss of privacy is likely to occur. The proposed in the rear dormer extension would cause no more overlooking or loss of privacy than the existing first floor windows.

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 was considered that the proposal may be acceptable in light of the proposed changes that have been made following the previously refused application and that the design would not be so detrimental to the host dwelling, neighbouring semi and affect the character and appearance of the streetscene.

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.