

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

Application No : 19/02441/FULL6

Ward:
Bromley Town

Address : 27 Downs Hill Beckenham BR3 5HA

Objections: Yes

OS Grid Ref: E: 538916 N: 169774

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Cordery

Description of Development:

Part one/part two storey rear/side extensions with roof lights, removal of chimney and elevation alterations.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 3

Proposal

The application seeks consent for the construction of a part one/two storey rear/side extension with roof lights, removal of the chimney and elevational alterations.

The application has been amended and the first floor side extension has been reduced in depth.

Location and Key Constraints

The application relates to a two storey detached residential dwelling, which is located on the south east side of Downs Hill Road. The surrounding area is residential in character and comprises mainly detached dwellings. A railway line is situated to the rear of the site.

Comments from Local Residents and Groups

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and the following representations were received:

- Have spoken to neighbour and agreed in principle to extension. However having seen the plans it is clear that a pitched roof would be right up the boundary and will remove considerable morning light from the conservatory and patio area. Would request the extension is flat roofed in order to have minimum effect on the use of the neighbouring conservatory and patio.

- Existing extension is flat roofed and the wall is hard against the boundary. A pitched roof will overlap onto neighbouring property and guttering will overlap further. Need reassurance that none of the new structure would encroach or drain on to neighbouring land.
- No objecting to construction but implications for current lifestyle. After considering the plans and elevations note that the parapet that will ensure no part of building will cross onto neighbouring land.
- Loss of light due to size, closeness and darkness of the proposed pitched roof.
- Would like the elevation adjacent to neighbouring garden was not in brickwork at ground floor level but rendered white. Would prefer if this was painted pebbledash rather than smooth, in keeping with local properties.
- Very sympathetic to neighbours who have not yet moved in to a property which needs considerably modernisation and development.
- Existing neighbouring extension is not older than 1948. Understand 2 storey extensions must be at least 7m from the property boundary
- Because of the angle of the properties to each other on a corner and the fact that Number 27 extends further back than 29 the proposed two storey component would come within 1.1m of the property wall of 29 and tower directly over the conservatory. Currently the two storey parts of the building area 3m apart at the closest point. This is not at an aspect where either building can be seen from, or prevents light.
- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Loss of sunlight
- Comments about 'Right to Light'
- No light survey has been undertaken.
- The proposed constriction entails a wall of the property being around 30cm higher than the existing wall that is featureless and will continue away from the road at an angle.
- Will give perspective of a long narrow alley and the appearance of space an light between the properties is an important criterion for planning which might be compromised.

Consultee comments

Highways: - The development will result in loss of parking space by partial to a habitable accommodation. However, there are spaces available within the site's curtilage which would be utilised for parking. Therefore on balance as it is a small development I raise no objection to this proposal.

RECOMMENDATION

No objection; please include the following with any permission:
OC03 (Car Parking)

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

No relevant planning history

Considerations

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

- Design
- Neighbouring amenity

- Highways
- CIL

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. The Council consider that the retention of space around buildings at first floor level is essential to ensure adequate separation and to safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents. It is also important to prevent a cramped appearance and unrelated terracing from accordance. It is also considered important to protect high spatial standards and levels of visual amenity which characterise many of the Borough's residential areas.

The application property is a two storey detached residential dwelling. The area is residential in character and comprises mainly similar two storey detached properties. The host property had been extended to the side with a two storey flat roofed element which extended to half the depth of the dwelling. It has a wooden clad frontage at first floor level and is not considered to be very sympathetic to the appearance of the dwelling, when viewed from the front. The application property is located close to a bend within Downs Hill Road and the neighbour to the north west actually sits on this bend and therefore has a tapering plot. The two dwellings are face away from each at the front, taking into account the curvature of the road, however due to the tapering nature of the plots, the buildings then also taper inwards towards each other to the rear. This relationship has resulted in a greater degree separation when viewed from the streetscene, even with the existing flat roofed side addition which extends up the shared boundary. The existing extension has resulted in an established bulk between the dwellings in terms of the spatial qualities of the streetscene and the relationship of the dwellings is such that the overall appearance is not cramped due to the buildings being off-set from one another.

The proposed extension is similar in width to the existing arrangement and would continue to extend up to the shared boundary. However, it would now be deeper, extending further out towards the rear elevation, but this has been reduced since the application was first submitted and the added depth would now only be around 1.35m deeper than the existing arrangement.

It is also proposed to introduce a pitched roof. The extension would be set back marginally from the front elevation, and the roof would also be set down from the main ridge. It would therefore remain subservient in appearance and the use of the pitched roof is considered to be a visual improvement, being more sympathetic in form to the pitched roof host dwelling. Additionally, the extension would replace the cladding to the front in favour of a more complementary rendered finish.

The deeper flank wall would be visible between the dwellings and the new pitched roof would add to the massing of the building. However, this deeper flank and higher roof would not significantly erode the spatial qualities of the streetscene, particularly when taking into account the established bulk of the existing extension and tapered nature of the buildings, which has resulted in a more generous separation to the front. The extension would not appear cramped and any limited harm to the spatial qualities of the streetscene would be outweighed by the visual improvements to the dwelling as a whole as a result of the new pitched roof and rendered finish.

Policy 8 has two purposes; the first is to protect the spatial standards of residential areas from cramped terrace, however the second is also to safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents. In this case it is considered that whilst the proposal would not comply with the requirements of this policy as 1m side space is not retained to the common boundary, the development would not result in material harm to the spatial qualities of the streetscene and a satisfactory degree of separation would be retained to prevent a cramped appearance and unrelated terracing. However, the impact on visual amenities of adjoining residents is discussed below.

The proposal also includes the construction of a single storey rear extension. This would have a staggered building line, but in terms of massing it is considered to be in proportion with the host dwelling and site in general. It would have a flat roof and would utilise brickwork for the external finish. It would have limited impact on the public realm due to the location at the rear and overall its appearance would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the locality and host property. Ample amenity space would be retained at the rear.

Neighbouring amenity

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

Number 25 Downs Hill is located to the south east of the site. The two storey element of the scheme would be set away from this neighbour and would therefore have no impact. The single storey extension would be set adjacent to the shared boundary; however this property appears to have been extended at ground floor level. The depth of the proposed ground floor element is not considered to be excessive and would be suitably mitigated by the separation, due to the detached nature of the properties, neighbouring development and orientation of the site, which would prevent any loss of outlook, loss of light or overshadowing.

Number 29 is located to the north west of the site. This property is set at angle to the host dwelling and the two dwellings taper inwards towards at the rear. Number 29 has been extended at the rear by way of a conservatory, which sits around 1m from the shared boundary at its narrowest point. As already noted the existing extension only extends to half the depth of the host property and a single storey element sits to the rear of this. The first floor element does not therefore currently project beyond the rear of Number 29.

The proposed first floor element would extend further towards the rear elevation, but the proposal has been amended and would now no longer project beyond the rear of Number 29. This reduction in depth has also resulted in a reduction in the scale and height of the pitched roof above, which lessens the overall bulk of this extended element. The relationship between the host dwelling and Number 29 is unusual due to the position of the extension along the boundary and tapered orientation of the buildings. However, it is not considered that the additional depth of the side addition would be significantly imposing, particularly now that it has been reduced in depth.

The added bulk from the roof and extended form would be visible, but is not considered that it would be significantly dominant or materially intrusive. The neighbour at Number 29 has raised concerns about a loss of light, particularly during the morning hours. Whilst there may be some loss of light at this time, as a result the extended form of the roof, the gardens have a southerly aspect. Therefore, any loss of light or overshadowing would not be for whole of the day and would be restricted to a short period during the morning. As such, any limited loss of light or overshadowing experienced by Number 29 is not considered to be sufficient to withhold planning permission.

The single storey element to the side/rear would also extend up to the boundary; however there is already a single storey element within this location. This has a pitched roof, with the ridge height of 3.2m and an eaves height of 2.2m. The proposed extension would not project significantly beyond the maximum extent of this existing element, but the overall eaves height would be greater, being raised up to 3.1m. However, the existing ridge measures 3.2m and therefore, it is not considered that the proposed arrangement would result in a visual impact which is materially worse than the established arrangement.

One small roof light is proposed within the side facing roof slope, however no windows are proposed within the flank elevations. There is already an established degree of overlooking towards the front and rear of the site and the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy which is significantly different to the current arrangement.

Highways

The development would include a small garage, but this would not be large enough to hold a car. However, there is still off-street parking on the frontage, which is considered to be sufficient. The Council's highways officer has not raised any objections to the development, but has requested a condition requesting parking to be provided in accordance with the approved plans. However, the off-street parking space is not under consideration and the garage is not large enough to hold a car. Therefore this is not considered to be reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

Having had regard to the above it is considered that the development is acceptable in design terms and there would be no material harm on neighbouring residential amenities.

as amended by documents received on 21.08.2019

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 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 37 of the Bromley Local 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 37 of the Bromley Local Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.