

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

**Application No :** 11/02014/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Plaistow And Sundridge**

**Address :** 10 Park Grove Bromley BR1 3HR

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 540845 N: 169778

**Applicant :** Mr Farah

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Part one/two storey rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding

**Proposal**

Members will remember that this application was put before Committee on 1st September 2011 and was deferred without prejudice in order to consider the recent Appeal decision relating to the previously refused scheme. The Inspector's comments have been included within the report.

The proposal seeks permission for a part one/two storey rear extension.

- The ground floor element of this proposal will span the width of the host dwellinghouse at approximately 7.89 metres in total, projecting in depth by 3.5 metres, and the single storey part, to be located towards the southern property boundary shared with No. 8 Park Grove, will have a pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.6 metres and a maximum ridge height of 3.6 metres.
- The first floor element of the rear extension will be located towards the northern side of the host dwellinghouse, with the northern flank elevation of the extension being in line with the northern flank elevation of the host dwelling, retaining a separation of 1.55 metres to the northern property boundary. This aspect will have an eaves height of 4.6 metres to match the eaves height of the host dwellinghouse, and a maximum ridge height of 6.7 metres. This will be 2 metres lower than the maximum ridge height of the main dwellinghouse, and 0.3 metres lower than the pitched roof which exists to the rear of the host dwellinghouse.

## **Location**

The application site is located on the eastern side of Park Grove, at the end of the road. The northern flank property boundary of the application site is shared with the rear property boundaries of a number of properties along Hansom Terrace, Freelands Grove.

## **Comments from Local Residents**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- proposed extension will still extend across the width of neighbouring garden;
- impact upon daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties, especially in winter;
- height of proposed extension in relation to neighbouring properties and associated loss of daylight, sunlight and outlook;
- comments within supporting letter which is part of the application are unfair.

## **Comments from Consultees**

No consultations were carried out for this application.

## **Planning Considerations**

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan and the London Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development  
H8 Residential Extensions  
H9 Side Space

## **Planning History**

In terms of relevant planning history, permission was recently refused under ref. 11/00280 for a part one/two storey side and rear extension for the following reason:

The proposed side and rear extension would, by reason of its proximity to the boundary and excessive rearward projection, have a seriously detrimental effect on the visual impact and daylighting to neighbouring properties, and the prospect which the occupants of these dwellings might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy, contrary to Policies BE1, H9 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

An appeal was lodged with The Planning Inspectorate and was dismissed on 15th August 2011. The Inspector stated in effect that the main issue of the scheme was considered to be the living conditions of the residents of Number 8 Park Grove with regard to outlook, and also the residents of Hansom Terrace with regard to outlook and sunlight.

The Inspector was of the belief that the proposal would further reduce the already limited outlook from Hansom Terrace and would add to the overbearing impact of the existing wall and dwelling. The depth of the proposed two storey element would lead to a further reduction in outlook at a scale that would be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of the residents of Hansom Terrace, however it was not considered to have an unacceptable impact upon levels of sunlight afforded to properties along Hansom Terrace.

In terms of the rear extension, the eaves would have been higher than the existing boundary fence although the design would ensure that the overall height would be limited and the glazed construction would further reduce the impact. Whilst of limited overall height, the structure would be significantly longer than that allowed under 'permitted development' tolerances, therefore would be apparent for a substantial length of the area of garden immediately to the rear of the neighbouring house which would reduce the outlook from the rear garden and the nearest rear facing room to the extent that would be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of the residents of Number 8 Park Grove.

The Inspector concluded that although the proposal would not significantly increase shading, the proposal would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the residents of Hansom Terrace and 8 Park Grove with regard to outlook by way of the depth of both the conservatory and the two storey extension.

## **Conclusions**

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area, the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties, and the comparison between the previously refused scheme and the current proposal.

The refusal ground for application ref. 11/00280 relates to the proximity of the extension to the property boundary and the excessive rearward projection. The current scheme has been revised by reducing the rearward projection by a metre, from 4.5 metres to 3.5 metres. In addition, the side extension has been removed from the scheme altogether.

Members may consider that a rearward projection of 3.5 metres for a detached dwellinghouse is considered acceptable on the basis of the separation between properties and any subsequent possible impact that this depth may have upon outlook, prospect and amenity for residents of neighbouring properties. The Appeal Inspector concluded that the depth of the previous scheme was excessive and would lead to unacceptable harm in terms of outlook for the residents of adjacent properties. As such, Members may consider that a reduction by 1 metre in terms of the depth of the rear extension will be acceptable and the resulting extension will not harm the outlook of No. 8 Park Grove.

In addition, removing the side extension element from the scheme entirely has addressed the part of the refusal ground relating to the proximity of the previously proposed extension to the property boundary and Members may consider has addressed the concerns raised by the Inspector that the previous side extension

would have unacceptable harm upon the outlook of the residents of Hansom Terrace.

Members may therefore consider that the alterations to the scheme that are now being proposed is a substantial improvement to the previously refused scheme. The removal of the side extension has addressed the concerns relating to the negative impact upon the residents of Hansom Terrace, and the reduction in depth of the rear extension will minimise the impact of the extension upon the amenities of the residents of neighbouring properties on both sides, along Hansom Terrace and Number 8 Park Grove.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 11/00280 and 11/02014, excluding exempt information.

### **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1     ACA01       Commencement of development within 3 yrs  
      ACA01R     A01 Reason 3 years
- 2     ACC04       Matching materials  
      ACC04R     Reason C04
- 3     ACI13       No windows (2 inserts)         flank   two storey rear extension  
      ACI13R     I13 reason (1 insert)   BE1 and H8
- 4     ACI17       No additional windows (2 inserts)   southern flank         single  
      storey rear extension  
      ACI17R     I17 reason (1 insert)   BE1 and H8
- 5     ACK01       Compliance with submitted plan

**Reason:** In order to protect the residential amenities of neighbouring properties and to comply with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

### **Reasons for granting permission:**

In granting permission the Local Planning Authority had regard to the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

- BE1   Design of New Development
- H8    Residential Extensions
- H9    Side Space

The development is considered to be satisfactory in relation to the following:

- (a)   the appearance of the development in the street scene;
- (b)   the appearance of the development in relation to the character of the area;
- (c)   the relationship of the development to the adjacent properties;
- (d)   the character of development in the surrounding area;
- (e)   the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties;
- (f)   the light and outlook of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties;

- (g) the privacy of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties;
- (h) the housing policies of the development plan;
- (i) and having regard to all other matters raised including concerns from neighbours.

**Application:**11/02014/FULL6

**Address:** 10 Park Grove Bromley BR1 3HR

**Proposal:** Part one/two storey rear extension

