

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

**Application No :** 11/03322/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Mottingham And Chislehurst  
North**

**Address :** 52 Grove Park Road Mottingham  
London SE9 4QB

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 541647 N: 172512

**Applicant :** Mr A Kundra

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Part one/two storey rear and first floor side extensions, new vehicular access to provide in/out drive

Key designations:

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

**Proposal**

This proposal is for a part one/two storey rear extension which would have a maximum depth of 4.7m from the rear elevation of the garage and 3m from the rear elevation of the main dwellinghouse at a ground floor level and would have a maximum depth of 1.8m to the rear at a first floor level. A first floor side/rear extension is also proposed which would project 3.7m to the side and would be stepped back 0.9m from the principal elevation and 1m from the flank boundary. A new vehicular access to provide an in/out drive is also proposed.

**Location**

The application site is located to the north of Grove Park Road and is a detached two storey dwellinghouse with attached garage. Properties in the area are primarily detached two storey dwellinghouses of varying scales and architectural styles.

**Comments from Local Residents**

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

- the proposed in/out drive would require the felling of a large, mature Prunus which is likely to be as old as the house (1925) which is one of the largest trees in the vicinity and makes a valuable contribution to the streetscene in Grove Park Road. The tree provides protection for Nos. 52 and 54 from noise and pollution from the main road.
- structural concerns in relation to the first floor side extension and implications on party wall with No. 54.

### **Comments from Consultees**

From a trees perspective the proposed in/out drive would require the felling of a tree which has been indicated on the plans but not acknowledged within the application form, however, it was not subject to a Tree Preservation Order and has now been removed.

From a highways perspective the site is located to the north of Grove Park Road. Grove Park Road (B226) is a London Distributor Road (LDR). The applicant is proposing to construct a second vehicular crossover, this is acceptable as there is adequate depth available for vehicle(s) to enter and egress the site in a forward gear. The part one/two storey rear and first floor side extensions element of proposal is also satisfactory, subject to conditions.

### **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**

There is no recent planning history at this site.

### **Conclusions**

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

The neighbouring properties differ in terms of their architectural style and scale and as such there is no uniformity in the area in terms of design. The proposed first floor side extension would be set back from the front of the property by 0.9m and would have a lower roofline than the existing property resulting in a subservient appearance.

The proposed single storey rear element of the proposal would be in line with the neighbouring properties at No. 54 and 50 which have existing single storey side extensions and/or attached garages of a similar scale to that proposed and as such

the impacts of the single storey rear element of the proposal on the residential amenities of these properties is anticipated to be minimal.

The first floor rear extension of 1.7m is considered to be modest in scale. It would not project beyond the existing rear elevation of the original dwellinghouse closest to the boundary with No. 50 and as such the proposal is not anticipated to result in any additional impact on the residential amenities of this property.

The first floor side extension element of the proposal would be stepped back 1m from the flank boundary with No. 54. This property has previously been granted for a two storey side extension under planning ref: 91/01861/FUL. As the proposed first floor side extension would be stepped back 0.9m from the principal elevation it would not project significantly beyond the front dormer window at No. 54. The flank elevation of No. 54 contains a first floor window which the occupant of No. 54 has confirmed is a secondary window for a bathroom as opposed to a habitable room. No windows would be located in the flank elevation of the proposal. Therefore, given the distance to the boundary and orientation of the site the potential impact on the residential amenities of No. 54 is considered to be acceptable.

A 1m side space would be maintained from the proposed first flank wall to the boundary with No. 54, however, this would not be to the entire elevation. This is because the existing flank wall of the attached single storey garage projects up to the boundary meaning there would be a breach of Policy H9 which states “for a proposal of two or more storeys in height, a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site should be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building”. In this instance, a 1m side space would not be retained for the full height and width of the flank elevation resulting in a retrograde lowering of spatial standards to which the area is currently developed, and as such refusal is recommended on this basis.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is unacceptable in that it would impact detrimentally on the character of the area as a minimum distance of 1m would not be retained to the full height and first of the proposed flank elevation.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 11/03322, excluding exempt information.

## **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED**

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirement for a minimum 1 metre side space be maintained to the flank boundary for the full height and width of the proposed first floor side/rear extension, in the absence of which the extension would constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed and contrary to Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**Application:**11/03322/FULL6

**Address:** 52 Grove Park Road Mottingham London SE9 4QB

**Proposal:** Part one/two storey rear and first floor side extensions, new vehicular access to provide in/out drive

