

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

Application No : 19/02014/FULL6

**Ward:
Hayes And Coney Hall**

Address : 21 Queensway West Wickham BR4 9EP Objections: No

OS Grid Ref: E: 539422 N: 165084

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Chappell

Description of Development:

Two storey side and part one/ two storey rear extensions and raised patio to the rear (Part retrospective)

Key designations:
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

The application seeks consent for the construction of a two storey side and part one/two storey rear extensions and raised patio at the rear.

The application is part retrospective and a number of retaining walls for the ground floor rear addition and side addition have been partially erected. A raised terrace has also been constructed.

The application has been revised and amended plans submitted which show a reduction in the size of the rear terrace by 50 percent and this now measure 1.5m in depth.

The applicant has also clarified the boundary line.

The application is a resubmission following the refusal of planning permission for a similar development.

Location and Key Constraints

The application site hosts a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the North Eastern side of Queensway, West Wickham. At the time of the site visit some works to construct the rear extension had been started but were in an unfinished state.

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 development plan for Bromley comprises the Bromley Local Plan (2019) & the London Plan (March 2016).

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies

London Plan Policies)

7.4 Local character

7.6 Architecture

Bromley 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:

17/00372/FULL6 - Part one/two storey side/rear extension and steps. Permission

17/05148/FULL6 - Demolition of existing garage and outbuildings: the erection of a two storey side and rear extension to dwelling with rear dormer. Permission

19/00233/FULL6 - Two storey side, part one/ two storey rear extensions. Hip to gable loft conversion to incorporate front roof lights and rear dormer with Juliet balcony. Refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed side extension and roof alterations as a result of their design, scale and inadequate side space would result in a bulky and unsympathetic form of development harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling, semi-detached pair and area in general contrary to Policies 6, 8 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) and Supplementary Planning Guidance 1.
2. The proposed single storey rear extension by reason of its depth and location would result in dominant form of development harmful to the visual amenities of Number 23 Queensway by reason of lost outlook contrary to Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019).

Other relevant planning history

16 Queens Way

14/04847/FULL6 - Part one/two storey front/side and rear extension and roof lights in roof. Refused by allowed on appeal under ref: APP/G5180/D/15/3130346 on 26th November 2015

26 Queensway

17/04457/FULL6 - Part one/two side and rear extensions and roof alterations incorporating partial hip to gable and front and rear rooflight to create habitable accommodation. Refused but allowed on appeal under ref: APP/G5180/D/18/3195059 on the 3rd May 2018.

38 Queensway

13/01367/FULL6 - Part one/two storey side and rear extension and roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer extension. Refused

13/02914/FULL6 - Roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer extension, part one/two storey side and rear extension with pitched roof to front and elevational alterations. Permission

45 Queensway

13/01543/FULL6 - Two storey side and single storey rear extensions and pitched roof to front. Refused but allowed on appeal.

Considerations

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

- Design
- Neighbouring amenity
- Highways
- CIL

Consideration will also be given to the previous reasons for refusal.

Design

Policy 6 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) states that 'The scale, form and materials should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area', it goes on to state that 'Space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.'

Policy 8 of the BLP normally requires extensions of two or more storeys in height to be a minimum of 1m from the side boundary of the site for the full height and length of the building.

There are two extant permissions for part one/two storey side and rear extensions at the time of writing and these are outlined in the history section above. However as noted, the applicant has sought to revise the proposal due to structural issues with the previous plans.

Queensway is a residential road comprising mainly semi-detached two storey properties which have prominent central gables with neo-Tudor detailing. Many of these surrounding neighbours have been extended by some form of addition, including side extensions, rear extensions and roof alterations. Most notably, there are similar two storey side extensions within Queensway and a couple are only a short walk from the site, including Numbers 16, 26, 34 & 38.

The closest examples are at Number 16 and 26 Queensway. The example at Number 16 (planning ref: 14/04847/FULL6) was allowed on appeal. However this example includes a gable end roof feature. Number 26 has been extended by way of a two storey side and rear extension, including barn hip roof. This example is highly visible within the street due to its position on a corner.

Therefore side additions within the wider streetscene are not uncommon. Material in the determination of this application is the fact that 2 extant permissions currently exist for a two storey side addition. These examples are not that dissimilar in both form and width to the current scheme.

This proposal has been revised substantially since the previous refusal. That scheme included significant alterations to the roof which included a full gable end to the side addition and large rear dormer. The gable roof of the side addition extended back and encompassed the depth of the first floor rear addition and, at the time, the overall appearance was considered to be bulky in form and unsympathetic in appearance. It was concluded that that scheme would not have been subservient in appearance and would have unbalanced the semi-detached pair.

The current proposal has now removed the roof additions comprising the side gable and large rear dormer. It now includes a hipped design to the side extension, but also to the roof of the first floor rear addition. Additionally, the side addition would be set back marginally from the front elevation. The form of the original dwelling, including original front gable and hipped roof would be discernible, and the removal of the large roof additions significantly lessens the bulk of the development. The principle of a two storey side addition has already been accepted by the extant permissions and the design and form of this current scheme is very similar to those examples. There are also two storey side extensions located within the wider locality. Therefore, it would not appear out of character in this context and is now considered to be generally in keeping with the host dwelling. The removal of the gable end and more subservient form of the extension would also now preserve the appearance of the semi-detached pair.

There was previously some ambiguity around the boundary position, which previously showed a 915mm separation between the flank wall of the development and the boundary. The applicant has now clarified this and the plans show the provision of the necessary 1m side space as required by Policy 8. However, even if this wasn't the case, the removal of side gable and retention of a pitched roof would mean that there would be a greater appreciation of space between the dwellings. This space retained between this property and the neighbour would be sufficient to prevent any appearance of unrelated terracing and the spatial qualities of the streetscene would be preserved.

The scheme also includes the construction of a first floor rear addition and single storey rear extension. Again, the principle of a single storey rear extension and first floor rear addition has been accepted by the extant permissions. The adjoining neighbour at Number 23 has a two storey rear projection and therefore the first floor addition would not appear significantly incongruous in this context. It would include a pitched roof which extends the existing rear pitched out marginally beyond the existing arrangement, but it would still be similar in form to the current design and the removal of the rear dormer has satisfactorily addressed previous concerns relating to scale and bulk.

Therefore, the current proposal and revisions have satisfactorily addressed previous objections and the proposed side extension and rear additions would not result in material harm to the character and appearance of the property or semi-detached pair, and the spatial qualities of the streetscene would be preserved.

Neighbouring amenity

It is noted that extant permissions exist for part one/two storey extensions at the host site and that works to construct the single storey rear extension have started; comprising breeze block walls and foundations. A raised patio was also at a significant stage of completion, spanning the full width of the property.

In relation to neighbouring amenity the main impact would be on the adjoining properties.

When considering the merits of the extant schemes no objections were raised in respect of neighbouring amenities. The applicant also indicated at the time of the site visit that construction had been halted in part due to structural issues with the original drawings.

The property at number 23 benefits from a single storey rear addition and an unusual two-storey rear extension which has a curved elevation. There is a change in ground level across the site, with the dwellings being set at a higher ground level and this then steps down by around 1 metre to the lower garden. The neighbouring property at 23 also has a raised patio and is located to the south east of the development.

The first floor rear extension would project 1.6m past the original rear building line, and there are several windows in the rear of number 23 nearest the boundary, however as confirmed by the plans under reference 89/03549/FUL both of these windows serve bathrooms, and as such there would be no impact on any habitable rooms.

The combined depth of the ground floor element would be approximately 6.7m but due to the neighbouring development the plans shows the extension projecting around 4.4m past the rear building line of number 23. The extant permission under ref: 17/05148/FULL6 shows this level of projection to be around 3.6m. This property benefits from a raised patio adjacent to the extension and the remainder of the garden is set at a lower level. It is also set to the south east of the proposed development.

The 3.6m deep projection within the extant permission was considered to be acceptable. However concerns were raised to a 4.4m deep projection beyond number 23 within the most recent refused scheme. This is around 0.8m deeper than the approved development, however there is some ambiguity surrounding the accuracy of the original plans which were provided by a different architect who no longer is working on the proposal.

The orientation of Number 23 in relation to the proposal would prevent a significant loss of light or overshadowing. However, at the time of the previous submission it was considered that the depth of extension and changes in ground level would have meant that the increased level of projection beyond 23 would have been bulkier and generally more dominant over and above the extant development, thereby being harmful to the visual amenities of this neighbour by way of reduced outlook and increased sense of enclosure.

No changes have been made to this single storey rear addition within this resubmission; however the applicant has provided further photographic evidence which provides greater clarity around the neighbouring patio level and its full extent. This photographic detail shows that the neighbours raised patio extends virtually to the same depth as the proposed extension, and even appears marginally deeper. It also appears marginally higher than first perceived. Therefore, whilst 4.4m is still considered to be deep, the 0.8m projection beyond the extant development, when now taking into the account the similar depth of the neighbour patio and its height in relation to this structure, would unlikely appear as

bulky or visually dominate as first thought. When weighing this more modest impact with the southern orientation of number 23, together with the fact they have also been extended by way of part one/two storey rear extension and also benefit from a generous garden which is both wide and deep, the visual impact is now considered to be on balance acceptable. Moreover, weight is given to the fact that at no time, in any of the 4 most recent applications considered by the Council, has an objection been raised by Number 23. Therefore, when taking all of the above factors into account the impact on Number 23 is now considered to be on balance acceptable.

The property at number 19 has a side extension which is set in from the boundary; as such the main dwelling is approximately 3m from the common boundary. Whilst this property is located to North West it is considered that the level of separation would mitigate the impact of the development and the impact on the residential amenities of this neighbour would not be significantly harmed.

One upper level window is proposed within the side of the building. This would serve a bathroom and could be conditioned to be obscured glazed and non-opening to protect neighbouring amenities.

At the time of the original site visit it was also apparent that the applicant had erected a raised patio. The current application has also sought to regularise this raised outdoor area, however they have amended the scheme and substantially reduced it in depth. This would now only be 1.5m deep and 480mm in height at its maximum point. The terrace would extend up the boundary with the adjoined neighbour but would be set away from the other boundary with Number 19. The depth is not considered to be large enough for significant use in terms of sitting out. Whilst there is overlooking into neighbouring gardens there was an established degree of overlooking between the neighbours from the existing fenestration within the building and outdoor patios. The depth of the terrace would allow for more transient movements into the lower garden. Additionally, no objections have been raised by the immediate neighbours to the existing unauthorised patio which is substantially deeper and higher than the revised proposal. Therefore the impact on neighbouring amenities is considered to be on balance acceptable.

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 proposed changes and additional information has satisfactorily address previous objections and the development is now considered to be acceptable in design terms and there would be no material harm on neighbouring residential amenities.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 The development shall be retained strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved.**

Reason: To ensure that the development is retained in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area and in order to comply with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan

- 2 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 37 of the Bromley Local Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

- 3 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed window(s) in the upper floor 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 (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 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan