

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

**Application No :** 18/03046/FULL6

**Ward:**  
West Wickham

**Address :** 62 Courtfield Rise West Wickham BR4 9BH

**Objections:** Yes

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 538909 N: 165423

**Applicant :** Mr Jim Grey

**Description of Development:**

Single storey side/rear and two storey side/rear extensions with loft conversion

Key designations:

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

**Update**

This application was deferred without prejudice by Members of the Plans Sub Committee 1 held on the 15th November in order to seek the relocation of the front entrance to the side.

The applicant has stated that they wish for the application to be determined as it was formerly submitted. They have provided a detailed response showing images of properties with front doors on same style houses. The full text of this information is available to view on file.

The contents of the original report are repeated below.

**Proposal**

The application proposes a single storey side, part one/two storey rear and first floor side extension with dormer window.

The single storey side extension would have a width of 1.9m and a depth of 12.8m. It would feature a pitched roof which would join the proposed first floor side extension.

The first floor side extension would be built on the existing catslide roof and would increase the floor area of the first floor where there is currently a roof void. The roof would adjoin the main dwelling at a height to provide habitable room within the loft, and two dormers would be included in the flank roofslope of the extension.

The rear extension would on the ground floor wrap around the existing kitchen extension and have a maximum depth of 4.4m and a width of 8m this would have a height of 2.8m. The first floor would have a depth of 3m and a width of 3.472m.

### **Location and Key Constraints**

The application site hosts a part one/two storey chalet bungalow on the northern side of Courtfield Rise, West Wickham.

### **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**

- Same plans as before and therefore same reason for objection.
- Ground floor side extension would come right up the driveway and be extremely close to driveway of 64.
- Loss of light.
- Loss of privacy.
- No other house of that style has the front door at the front of the house.
- Out of character.
- No issues if they did the same extensions everyone else has.
- Would set a dangerous precedent.
- Extension takes away off street parking and will result in more on street parking.
- Gross proposal in size and appearance.

#### **Response from applicant**

- We have not been re-submitting the same plans.
- Have taken planning advice.
- Many houses with doors at the front and side extensions.
- We have amended the side extension roof design to keep it more in keeping.

Revised Plans were received on the 1st October and local residents were reconsulted. The following comments were received;

- Can't see anything different from the previous proposals.
- Ground floor side extension is too close to driveway.
- Loss of light.
- No other house has this kind of extension at the side.
- No issue with the top side extension, loft conversion and back extension.
- Loss of privacy.
- No houses in this style in the road that have a front door at the front of the house (2 or 3 that do are a different style).
- The gap between No.64 and the side extension would only be the driveway of No.64.

- Out of character.
- Would spoil the aesthetic appearance of the housing in the road.
- Removal of garage and reduction of driveway would reduce off-street parking and increase congestion on street parking.
- Rear extension would project right up to boundary, blocking light and causing overshadowing.
- Gross proposal both in size and appearance.
- Previous objections still apply.

Further Revised Plans were received dated 22nd October and neighbours reconsulted. The following comments have been received, and Members will be updated verbally if any further representations are received;

- Please see previous objections.
- Plans have not been sufficiently changed.
- Property would be overdeveloped and imposing.
- Loss of privacy.
- Out of keeping with rest of the street (including position of front door).
- Loss of parking space will further crowd the road.
- Would set a precedent for similar developments.
- Ground side extension too close to neighbour's driveway.

### **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:

- 17/05125/FULL6 - Single storey side and rear extension - Refused
- 17/05127/FULL6 - Single storey side, part one/two storey rear and first floor side extension with dormer window - Refused
- 18/00264/FULL6 - Part one/two storey side and rear extensions, loft conversion and elevational alterations.- Refused

### **Considerations**

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

- Resubmission
- Design
- Neighbouring amenity
- Side Space
- CIL

#### Resubmission

The application was previously refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its excessive depth would create a tunnelling effect and cause significant harm to the outlook and amenity of the adjoining occupiers at number 60, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and Draft Policies 6 and 37 of the emerging Local Plan
2. The proposed side extension by reason of its unsympathetic design would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and street scene, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and Draft Policies 6 and 37 of the emerging Local Plan

The main alterations from the previously refused application that are proposed within the current application are the following;

The rear extension at ground floor has been reduced in depth from 4.4m to 3m along the boundary with No.60. It would retain a 3.47m wide section with a depth of 4.4m.

The first floor rear extension has been reduced to 3m in depth.

The proposed side extension has been altered from a flat roof to a pitched roof which slopes from the main dwelling down towards the flank boundary of the site.

The proposed roof alterations to provide accommodation at first floor and within the loft have altered to include the addition of two dormers in the flank roofslope, and have been set back from the front of the property to retain a section of the existing catslide roof.

## 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.

Within the previous application, concerns were raised with regards to the flat roof design of the single storey side extension given the open nature of these properties. Where other similar extensions have been built in the area they have featured pitched roofs to be more sympathetic to the design of the chalet bungalows with large cat-slide features. The current application retains a single storey side extension of the same depth and width, though has altered the roof design to include a pitched roof which pitches away from the flank boundary. The pitched roof design is considered more in keeping with the host dwelling than the previous application and is considered sufficient to overcome the previous refusal ground, in that it would not appear as an unsympathetic addition to the host

dwelling or have an unacceptable detrimental impact to the visual amenities of the area.

It is noted that there have been several alterations to the roof of properties in this area to extend the first floor where the catslide roof is. The alterations proposed would create significant bulk in the roof which would be highly visible given the shared driveways and the elevated position within the road.

This design would result in a roof enlargement which is reduced in bulk and scale to that proposed within the previously refused application 17/05127/FULL6, where it is noted that no concerns were raised regarding this particular element. The current application includes the addition of two dormers in the flank roofslope, though these would be modest in their scale and are not considered to harm the appearance of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the extension has been set back 0.5m from the front of the dwelling to retain a section of the existing catslide roof and provide a more subservient appearance compared to that previously proposed. Given the above, it is therefore considered on balance that any impact would not be so detrimental as to warrant refusal of the application given other similar extensions in the vicinity.

Having regard to the form, scale and siting 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

The Council requires all developments at first floor level to maintain a 1m space from the side boundary to the flank wall for the full height and length of the development. The proposed development would retain a 1m side space for its full length and is therefore considered to comply with Policy H9.

### 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 proposed single storey extension has been reduced in depth within this application so that it would project 3m in depth along the shared boundary with No.60. This is considered sufficient to overcome the previous refusal grounds, in that the rearward projection would not be considered excessive and would not result in a tunnelling effect. It is therefore considered the extension would not result in an unacceptable level of harm to outlook or light from this neighbour.

With regards to the neighbour at No.64, no concerns were raised within the previous application. The ground floor rear and side extensions would remain set in 1m from the shared boundary and whilst the roof of the side element would increase in bulk, it would pitch away from the boundary and is therefore not

considered to result in any significant additional harm compared to the previous application. Furthermore, the first floor rear extension has been reduced in its rearward projection from the previous application. The first floor side extension has been enlarged from the previous application, though to a scale similar to that proposed under ref: 17/05127/FULL6, where it was not considered that it would harm the amenities of the neighbouring property. Given the above it is therefore considered that any harm to the amenities of this neighbour would not be sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application.

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.

### 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 is considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable as 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 01.10.2018**

**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: 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 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed window(s) in the first floor flank elevation and the flank dormer windows 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 (s) 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**