

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 13/04193/FULL6

Ward:
Cray Valley West

Address : 42 Clarendon Way Chislehurst BR7 6RF

OS Grid Ref: E: 546016 N: 168603

Applicant : Mr I Sukevicius

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey rear extension and elevational alterations
PART RETROSPECTIVE

Key designations:

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

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the following:

- single storey rear extension with rearward projection of 4.2m and height of 3m
- the extension is proposed to be set in from the flank elevation of the property by 1.2m for the full length extension. A side space of 2.2m (approx .) is maintained between the flank elevation at the extension and the boundary with No.44
- the rearward extension continues level with the flank wall of the existing property (adjacent to No.40) for 1.5m, maintaining a side space to the boundary of 1m. The extension is then set in by a further 1.2m for the remaining 2.1m (approx) of the extension
- side and rear elevational alterations alterations including alterations to the first floor rear windows

The application is supported by a Design and Access Statement.

Members will note that application ref. 13/04191 for a similar single storey rear extension is also being considered on the Agenda. Application ref.13/04191 seeks planning permission for a similar extension without any set in adjacent to the boundary with No.44. The flank wall of the extension is in line with the existing flank wall of the property.

Location

Site relates to a two storey detached property located on south side of Clarendon Way. Detached properties of similar size but of varying design characterise the area .

Comments from Local Residents

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

- misrepresentations made in the statement submitted with application
- changes to step back the extension from both boundaries whilst not an ideal solution may be acceptable compromise (No.44)
- reduction in width should be continued for entire length of the extension, not stepped as shown at present (No.40)
- kitchen extractor and AIC unit should be repositioned to face southerly direction objections apply to both applications
- re-iterating concerns from the appeal against enforcement notice
- loss of outlook
- loss of light
- intrusion of privacy
- changes do not alleviate impact to adjacent neighbours
- misrepresentations made in the statement submitted with application
- clear that the applicants recognise extension not acceptable as it stands
- examples shown in the appendix not relevant
- discrepancies in the plans - kitchen door opens outwards, no extractor fans shown and no indication of a/c unit
- view of solid brick wall
- photographs have been attached
- concerns about outbuilding in rear garden

Full copies of the letters received are available on the file. Any further representations will be reported verbally at the meeting

Comments from Consultees

None

Planning Considerations

The main policies relevant to this case are Policies HB (Residential Extensions) and BE1 (Design of new development) of the Unitary Development Plan), which relate to the design of residential extensions and development in general.

Planning History

The planning history is summarised as follows :

- 12/03522- Part/one two storey rear extension and front porch. This application was refused and dismissed at appeal (although the front porch was allowed)
- 12/03518- Front boundary wall, piers, railings and sliding gates (maximum height of 2m) was refused for the following reason:

"The proposal, by virtue of its height and design, would be incongruous and detrimental to the visual amenities of the streetscene and therefore contrary to Policies BE1 and BE7 of the Unitary Development Plan. "

- 13/00155 - planning permission was refused and dismissed on appeal for the retrospective works at the site, including a single storey rear extension measuring 4.2m in depth, front entrance porch, and side and rear elevational alterations for the following reason:

"The single storey rear extension, by reason of its excessive rearward projection, has a seriously detrimental impact on the visual amenities of No.40 Clarendon Way and the prospect which the occupants of this dwelling might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan."

Most recently, planning permission was refused and enforcement action authorised under ref. 13/102625 at Plans-Sub Committee on 3rd October 2013 for the part retrospective works at the site. The application sought a lower roof height to previously refused under ref. 13/00155. The application was refused as follows:

"The single storey rear extension, by reason of its excessive rearward projection, has a seriously detrimental impact on the visual amenities of Nos. 40 and 44 Clarendon Way and the prospect which the occupants of these dwellings might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy, contrary to Policies BE1 and HB of the Unitary Development Plan."

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the impact the rear extension has on the character of the area and the amenity of the neighbouring properties 40 and 44 Clarendon Way.

Members will be aware that there is a complex planning history at the site, which includes a single storey rear extension measuring 4.2m, being refused and dismissed at appeal (ref.13/00155). The recently refused application attempted to overcome the previous concerns raised by the Council and the Planning Inspector by reducing the overall height of the extension. The raised decking area that was also indicated on the previous plans had also been removed. The current application seeks to address the concerns raised by setting in both sides of the existing extension. It is proposed to step back part of the flank wall nearest to No.42 by 1.2m and the entire flank wall adjacent to No.44 by 1.2m to reduce the

impact upon these neighbours. Members will need to consider whether these changes now warrant the granting of planning permission for amendments to the single storey extension constructed at the site.

The most recent application (ref. 13/02625) sought permission for amendments to the previously refused application (13/00155) which included a lower roof height, the removal of the decking and the obscure glazing of the end door panels. The planning history of the site has been summarised above and the previous refusal grounds and Planning Inspector's comments have been taken into account whilst assessing the current application. On this basis, the proposed changes in the current applications (refs. 13/04191 and 13/04193) are considered adequate to address previous concerns.

From visiting the application site, the orientation of the dwellings to the south suggests that there is unlikely to be an undue loss of light resulting from the single storey rear extension on the adjoining properties. No.40 is located to the west of the application site and is sited some 8m forward of No.42. This results in an existing poor relationship to the rear with No.40 presented with the flank of No.42. No. 40 benefits from a large open garden and southerly aspect that provides views across the garden from the large kitchen window and patio area.

In terms of No.44 to the east, the property follows a similar building line to the application site (the property benefits from a single storey rear extension) and the relationship between the two is better than with the residents at No.40. However, the key issues raised by the Inspector in the most recent appeal decision were the outlook and visual impact that the extension has on Nos. 40 and 44 and Members should take the impact on the adjoining residents into consideration.

In terms of overlooking, there would appear to be minimal impact given the removal of the raised decking. The Applicant has also indicated that once the bi-folding doors are fully open, the view would be restricted through the glass. It has also been stated by the Agent that the final panel of glass be obscure glazed should concerns remain.

To summarise, although the single storey rear extension would remain at the same depth of 4.2m as previously refused, given the proposed alterations to set in the extension from both boundaries, it is considered that the impact upon the visual amenities of both neighbours falls within acceptable levels. On balance, it is recommended that permission be granted. On balance, it is recommended that permission be granted.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 ACA01 Commencement of development within 3 yrs
ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
- 2 ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan
ACK05R K05 reason
- 3 ACI14 No balcony (1 insert) the single storey rear extension
ACI14R I14 reason (1 insert) BE1
- 4 The end panels of the doors nearest to the adjoining properties shall be
obscure glazed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved
in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the occupation of the
property.
ACI12R I12 reason (1 insert) BE1
- 5 Details of railings to be attached to the first floor rear windows shall be
submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to
the occupation of the property.
ACI14R I14 reason (1 insert) BE1

Application:13/04193/FULL6

Address: 42 Clarendon Way Chislehurst BR7 6RF

Proposal: Single storey rear extension and elevational alterations
PART RETROSPECTIVE



"This plan is provided to identify the location of the site and should not be used to identify the extent of the application site"

© Crown copyright and database rights 2013. Ordnance Survey 100017661.