

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

**Application No :** 14/02617/FULL1

**Ward:**  
Hayes And Coney Hall

**Address :** 53 Kechill Gardens Hayes Bromley BR2  
7NB

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 540392 N: 167128

**Applicant :** Mr Paul Nevard

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Erection of attached two storey 3 bedroom dwelling and extensions and alterations to 53 Kechill Gardens.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
River Centre Line

**Proposal**

The application proposes the erection of an attached two storey dwelling with garage, and extensions and alterations to 53 Kechill Gardens.

**Location**

The site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling house located to the northern end (cul-de-sac) and on the west side of Kechill Gardens. The immediate vicinity comprises a mix of semi-detached two storey and bungalow development.

**Comments from Local Residents**

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

- terrace house would be out of character
- incongruous development
- garden grabbing
- overdevelopment
- pressure on parking
- contravenes previous condition to prevent sub-division

- existing covenants

### **Comments from Consultees**

Design Out Crime comments are received and see no reason why the proposal cannot achieve the principles of Secured By Design. Recommendations are made in the event of a planning permission.

No Highway objections are raised to the proposal; conditions are suggested in the event of a planning permission.

### **Planning Considerations**

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

BE1 Design of New Development  
H7 Housing Density and Design  
H9 Side Space

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1  
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2

### **Planning History**

There is a significant planning history to the site which includes the following:

- 12/02589 - Part one/two storey side and rear extension - Permission
- 12/03353 - Two storey detached dwelling house - Refused for the following reason:

The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the spacious character of the surrounding area thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and the appeal was dismissed

- 13/00228 - Demolition of two storey extension and erection of two storey detached dwelling together with associated work to provide off street parking - Refused for the following reason:

The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the spacious character of the surrounding area thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and the appeal was dismissed

- 13/03420 - Erection of two storey dwelling with garage and additional attached garage to serve 53 Kechill Gardens on land adjacent 53 Kechill Gardens - Refused for the following reason:

The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the spacious character of the surrounding area thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 7.4 of the London Plan and the appeal was dismissed.

## **Conclusions**

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

In terms of the impact of the development on neighbouring amenities given the size, siting and design of the proposed dwelling it is not considered that the scheme will have such a negative impact on neighbouring amenities to warrant a planning refusal in this respect.

In respect of the effect that the development would have on the character of the area it should be noted that the previous grounds of refusal were concerned with overdevelopment of the site and harm caused to the spacious character of the surrounding area. The subsequent appeal decisions, now material considerations in any future development proposal at the site, noted that the gaps in between the pairs of houses provide substantial and important visual break along Kechill Gardens; combined with the setback of houses behind garden frontages and/or driveways an attractive, open and spacious quality to the area was provided. The Inspector's decision also noted that the houses in 'this part' of the street are semi-detached and provide a rhythm and uniformity to the area which serves to enhance its character and appearance. The Inspector opined that the introduction of a detached dwelling would appear alien and out of keeping with the surrounding area.

These historical applications related to the provision of a detached dwelling house. This current proposal is to consider the planning merits of an attached dwelling. It is noted that the planning history (ref. 12/02589) does allow for a substantial two storey side extension to the existing house with a side space to the southern boundary c 3.7m. That permission was subject to conditions, including Condition 4 which required that 'The additional accommodation shall be used only by members of the household occupying the dwelling at 53 Kechill Gardens and shall not be severed to form a separate self-contained unit'. The reason for the condition was to '...ensure that the accommodation was not used separately and unassociated with the main dwelling and so as to prevent an unsatisfactory sub-division into two dwellings'.

In terms of a satisfactory level of accommodation the scheme now presented for consideration is not considered to be sub-standard and would offer a satisfactory level of accommodation for existing and future occupiers.

The principle of the extent of the proposed built form is considered acceptable given permission ref. 12/02589 with the external appearance in keeping with the general character of the rest of the dwellings in the street. The submitted plans indicate that the proposed development is slightly less in bulk to the approved

extension. It is not considered that any greater sense of terracing would occur than the effect of the extant permission for the proposed extension.

As noted above, previous appeal decisions have referenced the rhythm and uniformity of development within the area. Additionally significant local concerns are recognised in respect of incongruous and over development.

The previous appeal decisions are material considerations within the consideration of this specific proposal. There are finely balanced consideration to this proposal given that the principle of the extent of the built form is acceptable, that a generous level of side space will remain to the southern boundary, that the host and resultant accommodation are not compromised and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The NPPF sets out a presumption in favour of sustainable development and encourages the provision of a good supply of a varied mix of homes. Policy BE1 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan 2006 (the UDP) sets out criteria which proposals for new development will be expected to meet. These include requirements for an attractive appearance, adequate space and suitable access and that the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings should be respected.

There is a significant planning history relating to detached dwellings on the site however a revised design approach has now been made and it is a carefully balanced decision that has to be made. Given the above, and on balance, it may be considered that the proposal is acceptable in that it would not harm the character and appearance of the existing building or the surrounding area and is therefore consistent with Policy BE1, that highways requirements are met and that it would provide an additional home in a sustainable location in accordance with advice in the NPPF.

Local concerns in respect of covenants are noted however this a matter between the two parties concerned and does not form part of the planning considerations.

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<br>ACA01R | Commencement of development within 3 yrs<br>A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2 | ACC04<br>ACC04R | Matching materials<br>Reason C04                               |
| 3 | ACA07<br>ACA07R | Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted<br>Reason A07         |
| 4 | ACC01<br>ACC01R | Satisfactory materials (ext'n'l surfaces)<br>Reason C01        |
| 5 | ACI02           | Rest of "pd" Rights - Class A, B,C and E                       |

**Reason:** In order to comply with Policy H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the neighbouring amenities.

- 6 ACH03 Satisfactory parking - full application  
ACH03R Reason H03
- 7 ACH16 Hardstanding for wash-down facilities  
ACH16R Reason H16
- 8 ACH32 Highway Drainage  
ADH32R Reason H32
- 9 No loose materials shall be used for surfacing of the parking and turning area hereby permitted.

**Reason:** In the interest of highway safety.

- 10 ACI08 Private vehicles only  
ACI08R Reason I08
- 11 ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan  
ACC01R Reason C01

### INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1 You should contact extension 4621 (020 8313 4621 direct line) at the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre with regard to the laying out of the crossover(s) and/or reinstatement of the existing crossover(s) as footway. A fee is payable for the estimate for the work which is refundable when the crossover (or other work) is carried out. A form to apply for an estimate for the work can be obtained by telephoning the Highways Customer Services Desk on the above number.
- 2 You are advised that this application may be liable for the payment of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the Planning Act 2008. The London Borough of Bromley is the Collecting Authority for the Mayor and this Levy is payable on the commencement of development (defined in Part 2, para 7 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). It is the responsibility of the owner and /or person(s) who have a material interest in the relevant land to pay the Levy (defined under Part 2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)).

If you fail to follow the payment procedure, the collecting authority may impose surcharges on this liability, take enforcement action, serve a stop notice to prohibit further development on the site and/or take action to recover the debt.

Further information about Community Infrastructure Levy can be found on attached information note and the Bromley website [www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL](http://www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL)

**Application:**14/02617/FULL1

**Address:** 53 Kechill Gardens Hayes Bromley BR2 7NB

**Proposal:** Erection of attached two storey 3 bedroom dwelling and extensions and alterations to 53 Kechill Gardens.



"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.