

Committee Date	26.11.2020		
Address	6 Hollydale Drive Bromley BR2 8QL		
Application Number	20/02999/FULL6	Officer - Emily Harris	
Ward	Bromley Common and Keston		
Proposal	Loft conversion comprising roof alterations, addition of 4 x dormers to rear with Juliet balconies and addition of rooflights.		
Applicant	Agent		
Mr Michael Battle	Mr Neil Warren		
6 Hollydale Drive Bromley BR2 8QL	2 Devon Court Sutton At Hone Dartford Kent DA4 9EP		
Reason for referral to committee	Call-In	Councillor call in Yes	

RECOMMENDATION	PERMISSION
-----------------------	------------

<p>KEY DESIGNATIONS</p> <p>Adjacent – Site Interest Nature Conserv. Area of Special residential Character Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area London City Airport Safeguarding Smoke Control</p>
--

Vehicle parking	Existing number of spaces	Total proposed including spaces retained	Difference in spaces (+ or -)
Standard car spaces	2	2	0

Disabled car spaces	0	0	0
Cycle	0	0	0

Electric car charging points	0
-------------------------------------	---

Representation summary	Neighbour letters issued – 17.09.2020		
Total number of responses	10		
Number in support	0		
Number of objections	10		

1. SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed development would be of an appropriate mass, scale, form and design that would be in keeping with its context, thus preserving the appearance of the site and surrounding area
- The proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers

2. LOCATION

2.1 The application site comprises a two storey detached dwellinghouse located on the western side of Hollydale Drive, Bromley. The property, which is not listed, lies within the Bromley Common Area of Special Residential Character.

The area is predominantly residential in nature. The surrounding properties comprise detached dwellings on generous plots. The property to the north No.5 is similar in design to the application property.

2.3 Site Location Plan:



3. PROPOSAL

3.1 The application seeks planning permission for a loft conversion comprising the enlargement of the roof at second floor level, with a steeper pitch than existing and a crown pitch at the top. The proposal also includes the addition of four dormers to the rear roofslope, each with a Juliet balcony. The dormers would have a depth of 1.4m, a width of 1.6m and a height of 2.2m. Two rooflights are shown on the roof.

3.2 Existing elevations:



EXISTING
FRONT ELEVATION
1:100



EXISTING
SIDE ELEVATION
1:100



EXISTING
REAR ELEVATION
1:100



EXISTING
SIDE ELEVATION
1:100

Existing Streetscene:



3.3 Proposed elevations:



Proposed streetscene



4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The following planning history was found on the site:

- 02/02589/FULL1 – Single storey side and rear extensions – Permitted
- 03/00607/FULL1 – Single storey front, side and rear extension – Permitted

5. CONSULTATION SUMMARY

a) Statutory

No requirement to consult any statutory consultees due to the nature of this application.

b) Residents groups/ conservation area groups

c) Adjoining Occupiers:

- Loss of Privacy, amenity and overlooking of our home and garden and also to those adjacent.
- Overbearing development
- Inappropriate design of the roof alterations, creating a sense of dominance towards neighbouring properties. The design and inclusion of balconies is overbearing.
- Potential loss of the unity, proportions and character of the neighbourhood. The enlarged roof and balcony projections go beyond the line of adjacent properties.
- The changes to the roof look to be disproportionately altering the roofline giving the property a very odd "Top Heavy" appearance that will make it out of character with all the other properties in the road.
- The house would look like a 3 story building with a flat roof, almost like a block of flats. At odds with the 1930's character as set out in the Bromley Common ASRC guidance.
- Would set a precedent for other residents.
- the design would dominate the eye-line with it's shape being very block-like and top-heavy. Feel a more conventional design, keeping a sloping roof at the rear and using 'Velux' type windows, would be less obtrusive and more harmonious with the surrounding houses.
- Extension would be box like which would result in a loss of unity, proportion and style.
- Hollydale Drive is a road used for overspill parking for hospital staff and is extremely busy Monday to Friday. During construction it would impossible to navigate the highway safely causing congestion and delay to traffic flow.
- Not in-keeping with the style of the houses in this very attractive 1930s road.
- As reported in detail by Orbis, most of the houses in this road, whilst not being identical, are based on a large chalet/cottage style design. The proposed design changes, especially to the first floor and roof section will be ugly and overbearing when viewed in this context. From the front, the sloping roof will dominate, occupying around 50% of the face presented to the road. From the rear, the addition of what is effectively a complete third floor, with the proposed Dormer windows and Juliet balconies, will compromise the privacy of neighbouring gardens and to a lesser extent the houses which back onto us in Rowan Walk.
- There is no detail provided of a transport or access plan during construction of any agreed proposal. There are existing parking restrictions in this road with parking permitted on only the common side. On weekdays, the available parking spaces are fully occupied, mostly by essential NHS workers at the Princess Royal University Hospital. Whilst we are happy to help by offering safe parking, it does mean that access to all our houses is somewhat restricted and much more so for large commercial or contractor's vehicles.
- No.6 Hollydale Drive comprises of a not insignificant detached, 4 bedroom house built in a suburban 'chalet' style having an extensive, raked front roof slope to the street, with more conventional two storey facades to the sides and rear. The raked roof to the front essentially creates the dominant visual reference point to the house. The two storey bay to the front (forming the existing lounge and master bedroom above) is half-

tilled, and so the building somewhat hugs the ground and effects a modest, cottage-like appearance, taking its reference from earlier arts and crafts designs that were typical of suburban expansion in the inter-war period. The house also has a single garage to the south and pleasant gardens to the front, with a low picket fence facing the street.

- The resulting roof would lose its homogenous, raking roof form characteristic of houses in this street and would increase the apparent bulk of the roof.
- The flank return hips would change the roof from a lightweight traditional slope to one that is clearly formed by a dominant crown roof, and rendering the roof as a top-heavy feature of the dwelling.

The full text on comments received are on file.

6. POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

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 development plan for Bromley comprises the Bromley Local Plan (Jan 2019) and the London Plan (March 2016). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

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 development plan for Bromley comprises the Bromley Local Plan (Jan 2019) and the London Plan (March 2016). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

Draft New London Plan

The 'Intend to Publish' version of draft London Plan (December 2019) is a material consideration in the determination of this planning application. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to: (1) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan; (2) the extent to which

there are unresolved objections to relevant policies in the emerging plan; and (3) the degree of consistency of relevant policies to the policies in the Framework.

The draft New London Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State (SoS) on 9 December 2019, following the Examination in Public which took place in 2019. This was version of the London Plan which the Mayor intended to publish, having considered the report and recommendations of the panel of Inspectors.

The London Assembly considered the draft new London Plan at a plenary meeting on 6 February 2020 and did not exercise their power to veto the plan.

After considering the 'Intend to Publish' Plan, on 13 March 2020 the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government wrote to the Mayor identifying directed changes to a number of policies in the draft plan. The SoS considered these changes were necessary to address concerns regarding inconsistencies with national policy. The Mayor cannot publish the New London Plan until the directed changes have been incorporated, or until alternative changes to address identified concerns have been agreed with the SoS. This could affect the weight given to the draft plan with regard to the directed policies.

At this stage, the Council's up-to-date Local Plan is generally considered to have primacy over the draft London Plan in planning determinations. However, where no modifications have been directed the draft London Plan policies are capable of having significant weight (as seen in a recent SoS call-in decision in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea). Where specific draft London Plan policies have been given particular weight in the determination of this application, this is discussed in this report.

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

37 General Design of Development

44 Areas of Special Residential Character (ASRC)

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1 - General Design Principles

SPG2 - Residential Design Guidance

7. ASSESSMENT

7.1 Design – Layout, scale height and massing – Acceptable

The ASRC guidance states the following:

“This is a pleasant residential area of established detached and primarily semi-detached properties adjacent to the Hollydale Recreation Ground. The area includes properties in Hollydale Drive, Rowan Walk, Lakeside Drive and Beverley Road and the Hollydale Recreation Ground, which is designated Urban Open Space. The area is a link between the residential areas closer to Bromley and the spaciousness of the Farnborough and Keston Park Conservation Areas.”

This row of houses is defined by its fairly consistent building line set behind landscaped front gardens, the gaps between the dwellings, and in some cases a distinctive front catslide roof. Whilst the extension would increase the bulk at roof level, the incorporation of the catslide roof design would be in keeping with the existing chalet style dwelling. In addition, the proposed roof enlargement would not be as noticeable when viewed from ground level.

The four rear dormers would however have no significant impact on the visual amenities of the area as it would largely be screened from view by virtue of their setting at the rear of the property. The materials are proposed to match the existing which would complement the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

The extension would not project to either side flank boundary; retaining sufficient space around the building and preserving the overall spatial standards of the area, and as such it would not lead to a cramped appearance or a terracing effect with the neighbouring dwellings which would otherwise be detrimental to the established character of the area of larger dwellings set within spacious plots. It is therefore not considered that the alterations would have a harmful impact on the streetscene, the wider area or detract from its setting within the ASRC.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposed extensions would respect the scale and form of the host dwelling and that of surrounding development and would not harm the character and appearance of the streetscene or wider Bromley Common ASRC within which it lies.

7.2 Neighbouring amenity – Acceptable

The proposed roof extension would be well separated from the party boundary and from residential development further along the street. Objections were received in regard to the overlooking from the four dormers proposed to the rear roofslope. Whilst the dormers would provide some opportunities for overlooking, this would not go over and above what would be expected in a residential setting such as this.

An objection was received in regard to the impact of traffic levels in the area. A transport or access management plan would not be required with a proposal of this size.

Having regard to the scale, siting, separation distance, orientation, existing boundary treatment of the development, it is not considered that a significant loss of amenity with particular regard to outlook, prospect and privacy would arise complying with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

8. CONCLUSION

8.1 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 or the Bromley Common Area of Special Residential Character.

8.3.2 It is therefore considered that planning permission be granted.

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

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS:

- 1) Standard time limit
- 2) Standard compliance to plans
- 3) Matching materials