

LONDON BOROUGH OF BROMLEY

**TOWN PLANNING
RENEWAL AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT**

DELEGATED DECISION on 8th January 2018

17/00812/AMD **24 Downs Hill**
Susanna **Beckenham**
Stevenson **BR3 5HB**

Description of Development

AMENDMENT: To change the rear glass doors from sliding to folding opening and to make small alterations to the dimensions of windows on all elevations.

To omit balustrades on the rear terrace.

To change the steps from the terrace to the garden from one wide flight in the centre to two more narrow flights with one at each side.

To erect two-metre tall slatted timber fences between the side walls of the house and the side boundary

Proposal

AMENDMENT:

This application seeks permission for a non-material amendment to the approved application 17/00812/FULL1 which was allowed at appeal and related to the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a replacement dwelling.

The proposed non-material amendment includes the following main alterations:

o Alterations to the rear terrace arrangements, including the substitution of 2 stepped accesses from the terrace down to garden level rather than the single centrally positioned access allowed at appeal. The proposed stairs are narrower and would be sited to the side of the terraces, close to the boundaries of the site.

o The balustrade to the terrace would be removed and in place a stepped arrangement of beds would address the change in ground levels at the rear of the property

o At the rear glass doors would be folding opening rather than sliding opening. Other windows would be amended in size. With regards to the side facing windows the proposed windows would be wider than those in the permitted scheme. These windows are to be obscure glazed as per the permitted scheme. At the front and rear the height of the windows would be reduced so as to negate the need for horizontal transoms.

o The submitted drawings show amendments to the stepped access arrangements to the side of the dwelling, with the position of steps relative to the dwelling altered. In addition, horizontal slatted fencing would be provided to the front of the side access, at right angles to the boundary so as to provide a secure boundary between the front and rear of the site.

Conclusion

In deciding whether the proposed changes are acceptable as non-material amendments, careful consideration needs to be given to the following three points:

1. Do the proposed changes differ in substance from the development that was granted planning permission?

The alterations to the fenestration would result in the windows being appreciably different to those in the original scheme. Similarly, the terrace arrangements with particular reference to the siting of the rear stepped accesses would be materially different to the original arrangements. It is noted that there are amendments to the side access ways with siting of steps in different positions to those granted planning permission.

Accordingly, the changes would differ in substance from the development which was granted planning permission.

2. Is the new development considered to deprive those who should have been consulted from such additional consultation as it may have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties or the character of the area generally? It is not considered that the widening of the windows on the flank elevation would have a greater impact on residential amenity than the scheme granted planning permission in view of the obscure glazing to the side windows and their position relative to neighbouring development.

However, it is noted that the dwelling is sited within a Conservation Area and the front window alterations would be visible from the street scene. The conditions imposed by the Inspector in granted permission for the development included condition 3 which relates to details of windows being submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, recognising the contribution that fenestration can make to the appearance of a building.

The positioning of the stepped access to the garden to the side of the terrace, closer to the boundaries of the site, rather than in the centre of the rear raised patio would also warrant consultation with neighbouring residents in view of the siting of the development. The removal of the balustrade and the formation of stepped beds to link the terrace to the garden would not be considered to warrant further consultation.

3. Does the cumulative impact of this alteration result in a development that is quite different from the original permission?

Taking account of the above, it is considered that the amendments in particular to the stepped access to the side/rear garden would constitute a material change to the development originally approved, as would the alteration to the fenestration to the front of the dwelling, which would be appreciable from the conservation area and for which consultation would be appropriate.

It is therefore considered that the alterations indicated would not be acceptable as a non-material amendment to the original permission. There is no judgement within this determination on the planning merits of the proposed amendments, and the determination that a fresh application would be required does not indicate that individual elements are unacceptable - it is an assessment of whether planning permission would be required rather than on the acceptability of the proposals.

Consultations

XX

Planning Considerations

XX

Conclusions

XX

Decision

Amendment Requires Planning Permission

For conditions or grounds of refusal please refer to the Decision Notice