

<b>Committee Date</b>	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2021	
<b>Address</b>	34 Towncourt Crescent Petts Wood Orpington BR5 1PQ	
<b>Application Number</b>	21/01292/FULL6	<b>Officer</b> - Lawrence Stannard
<b>Ward</b>	Petts Wood And Knoll	
<b>Proposal</b>	Loft conversion incorporating dormer to the rear and rooflights to the front	
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Agent</b>	
Mrs Annika Ware	Mr Roy Trute	
34 Towncourt Crescent Petts Wood Orpington BR5 1PQ	69 Ospringe Road Faversham ME13 7LG Kent	
<b>Reason for referral to committee</b>	<b>Call-In</b>	<b>Councillor call in</b>
	Call-In	Yes

<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>	Permission
-----------------------	------------

<p>KEY DESIGNATIONS</p> <p>Article 4 Direction Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area London City Airport Safeguarding Area of Special Residential Character Urban Open Space Smoke Control SCA 4</p>
--

<b>Representation summary</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbour notification letters were sent on the 30<sup>th</sup> March 2021</li> </ul>
Total number of responses	0
Number in support	0

Number of objections	0
----------------------	---

## 1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The development would not result in a harmful impact on the character of the Area of Special Residential Character.
- The development would not result in a harmful impact on the appearance of the host dwelling.
- The development would not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties

## 2 LOCATION

- 2.1 The application site hosts a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Towncourt Crescent.
- 2.2 The site is located within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).



Figure 1: Site Location Plan

### 3 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application seeks permission for a loft conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights.
- 3.2 The rear dormer would measure 6.4m wide and feature a dual gabled roof. It would replace an existing flat roof dormer (3.2m wide) and rear rooflight.
- 3.3 The proposed rooflights would consist of three Conservation style rooflights within the front roofslope.



Figure 2: Existing Front and Rear Elevations



Figure 3: Proposed Front and Rear Elevations

## 4 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 The application site has the following previous planning history.

- 19/05352/FULL6 – Single storey side / rear extension, front porch extension and conversion of garage to habitable space with elevational alterations – Permitted

4.2 The previous planning history of the site opposite at No.23 Towncourt Crescent is also considered relevant to this application. This site was granted permission on appeal following application ref:18/01063/FULL6 for a proposed hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights.



PROPOSED FRONT ELEVATION

Figure 4: Proposed Elevation at 23 Towncourt Crescent / Photo of 23 Towncourt Crescent

- 4.3 Within the appeal decision, the Inspector stated that “In reaching my conclusion to allow this appeal I have had particular regard to the fact that so many of the adjacent houses in Towncourt Crescent have been similarly altered by means of hip to gable extensions and the insertion of front-facing roof lights. It is also relevant that many of the nearby houses were originally erected to a similar design, incorporating a gable end configuration.”
- 4.4 They further stated that “Numerous pairs of houses are also unbalanced by virtue of one of the pair having been altered, with the other half retaining its hipped roof design. Of particular note are the unmatching pairs close by at nos. 9/11, 5/7 and 16/18 Towncourt Crescent. Hip to gable extensions were also evident at nos. 17/19 and no. 34. In addition, a large percentage of houses in the street have been altered from the original.”

## **5 CONSULTATION SUMMARY**

### **A) Statutory**

No Statutory Consultations were received.

### **B) Local Groups**

No comments were received from Local Groups.

### **C) Adjoining Occupiers**

No comments were received from adjoining occupiers.

## **6 POLICIES AND GUIDANCE**

6.1 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.

6.2 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.

6.3 The development plan for Bromley comprises the London Plan (March 2021) and the Bromley Local Plan (2019). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

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

### **6.5 National Policy Framework 2019**

#### **6.6 The London Plan**

- D1 London's form and characteristics
- D4 Delivering good design
- D5 Inclusive design

#### **6.7 Bromley Local Plan 2019**

- 6 Residential Extensions
- 37 General Design of Development
- 44 Areas of Special Residential Character
- 123 Sustainable Design and Construction

## 6.8 Bromley Supplementary Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 - General Design Principles  
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 - Residential Design Guidance

## 7 ASSESSMENT

### 7.1 Design – Layout, scale – Acceptable

- 7.1.1 The site is located within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). Policy 44 states that proposed developments within an ASRC will be required to respect, enhance and strengthen their special and distinctive qualities.
- 7.1.2 An Article 4 Direction has been in place since 11 January 2018 that is designed to protect the front roof slopes of all properties within the Petts Wood ASRC
- 7.1.3 The scheme proposes the addition of an enlarged dormer to the rear roof slope, and the addition of three Conservation style rooflights to the front.
- 7.1.4 The proposed rear dormer is not considered excessive in its scale and would appear similar in both size and design to others within the ASRC. Furthermore, given its siting to the rear it would not appear highly visible from the street scene. Having regard to this and the proposed external materials (tile hanging to match the existing roof), it is considered the rear dormer would not harm the appearance of the host dwelling or the character of the ASRC.
- 7.1.5 The proposed rooflights to the front would consist of the addition of three 'Conservation' style rooflights which would set flush with the front roof slope. It is noted that the host dwelling already benefits from an existing hip to gable extension, to which the rooflights would sit within the front roof slope.
- 7.1.6 The appeal decision at No.23 Towncourt Crescent which granted permission for a similar development is given significant weight when considering the impact of the front roof lights. Within this decision, the Inspector noted that "Numerous pairs of houses are also unbalanced by virtue of one of the pair having been altered" and that many properties feature front rooflights.



Figure 5: Rooflights within the street scene (No.26 / Nos. 15, 17, 19)

- 7.1.7 The existing property already features a hip to gable extension which unbalances the pair of semi-detached dwellings somewhat, and it is considered that the addition of three rooflights would therefore not result in any significant additional harm in terms of the visual unbalancing.
- 7.1.8 There are many properties within this part of the ASRC on the southern end of Towncourt Crescent that feature rooflights within their front roofslope. Furthermore, the size of the rooflights are not considered excessive and the use of 'Conservation' style rooflights would limit their visual impact somewhat.
- 7.1.9 Having regard to the design of the development, the appearance of the existing street scene and the appeal decision at No.23, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the character or appearance of the host building or the ASRC.

## 7.2 Residential Amenity – Acceptable

- 7.2.1 The proposed rear dormer would sit comfortably within the existing roof slope and is not considered excessive in its bulk and scale. Therefore, whilst it would be an enlargement from the existing dormer, it is not considered that it would result in any significant loss of light, outlook or visual amenity to nearby properties.
- 7.2.2 The rear dormer would have two rear facing windows at second floor level, though this would not provide any significant opportunities for additional overlooking compared to that which already exists from both first floor level and the existing dormer at second floor level.
- 7.2.3 The scale of the rooflights would be modest and given their separation distance and angle within the roofslope would not be considered to provide any significant opportunities for overlooking towards nearby neighbours including those opposite.
- 7.2.4 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.

## **8 CONCLUSION**

- 8.1 Having regard to the above, the development in the manner proposed is considered acceptable as it would not result in any unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents or the character and visual amenities of the Petts Wood ASRC.
- 8.2 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

**Conditions:**

1. Time Period
2. Matching Materials
3. Compliance with approved plans