

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

Application No : 18/03478/FULL6

Ward:
Bromley Town

Address : 17 Cameron Road, Bromley BR2 9AY

OS Grid Ref: E: 540180 N: 167977

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Hammound

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Proposed loft conversion with rear dormer, proposed single storey front elevation.
Proposed first floor (existing) altered + new dormer and bay to the first floor.
Proposed garage conversion. Facade alterations to ground floor side elevation
driveway increased in size

Key designations:

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

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Rear dormer extension and loft conversion

The rear dormer would be set in from the flank elevations of the host dwelling by approx. 2.65m and would be set in from the eaves of the host dwelling below. The dormer would be tile hung and would include 2 juliet balconies.

- Single storey front extension

The extension would infill and existing set back between the garage projection and the southern elevation of the dwelling, set beneath a pitched roof which would extend from the single storey front projection up to the ridgeline on a slightly modified roof pitch.

- First floor front extension, enlargement of dormer and new dormer

A centrally positioned front dormer/first floor front extension would be provided with a large front window which would serve the internal staircase. The extension would

incorporate a pitched/hipped roof and would be tile hung. A new dormer would be provided on the southern side of the extended roofslope, which would be of a size to match the enlarged dormer on the northern side of the roofslope. These dormers would be flat-roofed to match the existing.

- Conversion of garage to habitable room

The existing garage door would be replaced by a front facing window and the internal space used as a dining room extension.

- Elevational alterations

Including the replacement/removal of windows in the front elevation.

- Enlargement of driveway

The driveway would be widened in front of the house with the extended area of hardstanding being provided towards the southern boundary of the site.

Location and Key Constraints

The application site lies on the eastern side of Cameron Road and comprises a two storey detached dwellinghouse. The host and surrounding dwellings were constructed at the same time as part of a comprehensive estate development but while originally they would have had a uniform appearance, over time a number of the dwellings have been extended.

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

- o Inaccurate information re: tree in adjacent property. Proposal would harm the health and long term retention of the tree
- o On-going boundary dispute has not been referred to
- o Scale and bulk of the extension would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area and the appearance of the host dwelling.

Comments from Consultees (summarised)

Highways: No objections.

Tree Officer: No objections and no recommended conditions from a trees perspective. The proposed alterations and extensions do not pose a direct threat to the birch tree. I do not see it necessary to address the tree as a constraint on this basis and do not consider precautionary measures necessary in terms of conditional tree protection.

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

- H8 Residential extensions
- H9 Side space
- T3 Parking
- T18 Road safety
- BE1 Design of new development
- NE7 Development and trees

Draft Local Plan

6 Residential Extensions
8 Side Space
30 Parking
37 General Design of Development
73 Development and Trees

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

13/03893 - Planning permission was refused for a part one/two storey side/rear extension, single storey front extension and elevational alterations. Permission was refused on grounds relating solely to the impact of the proposal on a silver birch tree:

"The proposed extension is likely to adversely affect the long term future of the birch tree at the adjacent property, No. 15 Cameron Road, which contributes to the character and appearance of the area and which would be contrary to Policy NE7 of the Unitary Development Plan."

14/04528 - The Council resolved to contest an appeal against the non-determination of an application for a lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension. The appeal was dismissed.

Considerations

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

- Design
- Highways
- Neighbouring amenity
- Trees
- 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.

Policy H8 of the Unitary Development Plan relates to residential extensions and requires that the scale, form and materials of construction should complement the host dwelling and be compatible with surrounding development. With regards to dormer extension it is required that they should be of a size and design appropriate to the roofscape and sited away from prominent roof pitches unless dormers are a feature of the area.

It is noted that the proposal incorporates significant front roof development including the alteration to the pitch of the roof slope and the provision of a centrally positioned front gable roof extension. The proposal would also remove the set back on the front elevation between the catslide roof and the two storey front elevation.

The proposed development would be readily visible from the street scene. However, the palette of materials to be used to form the extensions and the overall scale of the development is not considered significantly harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling.

The proposed front dormers would bookend a large front first floor extension, which is noted to include a pitched roof with a sloping hipped front roof slope rather than a gable, with a ridgeline set significantly below that of the main roof slope. While readily visible, in the context of the width of the dwelling and the expanse of the extended front roof slope this is not considered to undermine the appearance of the host dwelling, being of a design and materials appropriate for the original dwelling.

In view of the lack of clear uniformity in built form in the grouping of dwellings within which the application dwelling lies it is not considered on balance that the proposal would undermine a distinctive character of development in the street scene. The extensions to the dwellings on either side of the host dwelling are clearly visible within the street scene, widening significantly those immediately neighbouring dwellings that have been extended and in context with these significant side extensions and front dormers, it is not considered that the form, scale and siting of the proposed extensions would be out of character with surrounding development or the area generally.

It is not considered that the proposed rear dormer extensions would have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area, nor that the infilling of the existing set-back in the front elevation and front roof slope would be detrimental to amenity.

The enlargement of the driveway would be of limited impact on visual amenity in view of its siting relative to the house and the frontage of the site.

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 transport issues should be considered from the earliest stage of both plan making and when formulating development proposals and development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

The NPPF states that all developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

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.

The proposal would result in the loss of an existing garage space by conversion to habitable accommodation. In view of the size of the frontage of the dwelling and the existing/proposed scope of the off-street parking available in front of the house it is not considered that this part of the proposal would be harmful to conditions of safety and the free flow of traffic in the adjacent highway, and nor would it lead to unacceptable pressure on on-street parking.

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.

It is not considered that the front extensions, side elevational alterations and rear dormer extensions would have a significant impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties. It is noted that the dwelling at No. 19 has a large double garage extension positioned towards the boundary with the host dwelling, with 2 small front dormers. In view of the separation to the boundary and the limited depth of the front extension it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant impact on outlook, privacy, light and prospect in respect of that dwelling, taking into account the position of the garage at that dwelling relative to the development proposed. With regards to the other neighbouring property at No. 15, that dwelling is set at a right angle to the front elevation of the host property, and there is adequate separation between the front extensions and the boundary to limit impact on amenity. Again, the host dwelling is separated from the habitable accommodation at the neighbouring dwelling by a double garage. With regards to the flank elevational alterations it is not considered, in view of the relationship between the dwellings, that these would result in a loss of privacy.

The proposed central front dormer/gable would include rooflights on the flank roof slopes, but these would serve an internal landing space and are not considered likely to result in a loss of privacy or overlooking to neighbouring dwellings which are in any case well-separated from the host dwelling.

It is noted that objections have been raised to the proposal with regards to the impact on the health and long term retention of a nearby tree but in view of the siting of the extensions/driveway alterations to the other side of the property with the exception of roof based extensions which would not involve significant excavation or impact on the tree, it is not considered that the refusal of permission on this basis would be warranted.

The submitted objection letter refers to the position of roots running beneath the house itself, with these illustrated as a regular circle based on the position of the trunk of the tree rather than being based upon any underground survey. Concern is expressed that the internal works will have an impact on these roots. On the basis of the relationship between the existing footprint of the dwelling and the tree, the fact that the proposal does not extend the dwelling outwards towards the tree, and the fact that internal alterations could be undertaken without the need for planning permission and therefore with no consideration of this aspect of the proposal, it is not considered that the refusal of permission on this basis would be capable of being sustained at appeal, should permission be refused.

The lack of an Arboricultural report is referred to as a potential ground for refusal but no objections have been raised by the Trees Officer in respect of the proposals.

Attention is drawn to an on-going boundary dispute between the applicants and the neighbours, but the issue of land ownership falls outside of planning control and constitutes a private legal matter. The applicant's agent has noted that the proposal does not relate to the driveway/access adjacent to No. 15 and that the driveway would be extended towards to No 19.

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.