

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 15/00998/FULL6

Ward:
Chislehurst

Address : 13 The Glebe Chislehurst BR7 5PX

OS Grid Ref: E: 544514 N: 169679

Applicant : Mr Jonathon De Maid

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey side/rear extension, glass balustrade to rear balcony, addition of roof canopy to rear, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and elevational alterations

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Chislehurst
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds Aldersmead Road
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds
Smoke Control SCA 16

Proposal

It is proposed to replace an existing garage on the eastern side of the dwelling with a part one/two storey side/rear extension which would be set back between 1-1.4m from the eastern flank boundary, and would project 9.3m to the rear of the main rear wall of the dwelling. The extension would be set back 0.75m from the front wall of the dwelling at ground floor level, and 2m at first floor level.

A 3.8m deep single storey rear infill extension would also be added, along with an open rear roof canopy at ground floor level adjacent to the western flank boundary with No.12. The existing rear balcony which lies adjacent to the western flank boundary would have glass balustrading installed to the southern and eastern sides whilst retaining the existing timber privacy screen separating it from the balcony to the west at No.12.

A small front infill extension is proposed to the integral garage on the western side of the dwelling, and it would then be converted into habitable accommodation.

The extensions and alterations to the property are required in order to make it more suitable for the needs of the applicant who is a wheelchair user.

No trees on the site are covered by a TPO, but the trees are protected by virtue of its location within Chislehurst Conservation Area. An arboricultural report has been submitted to support the application.

Location

This end-of-terrace two storey dwelling is located at the far eastern end of the cul-de-sac, and lies adjacent to the rear gardens of properties in Prince Consort Drive. The site is located within Chislehurst Conservation Area, and has a south-facing rear garden with a depth of 35-40m.

Consultations

A number of letters objecting to the proposals have been received from local residents, and the main points raised are summarised as follows:

- * overlarge extensions which would be out of proportion with the existing dwelling
- * reduction in spatial standards within the Conservation Area
- * excessive rearward projection of the extension beyond the general rear building line
- * loss of part of the front garden
- * overdevelopment
- * loss of outlook from neighbouring properties
- * overlooking from rear balcony
- * proposals would not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area
- * loss of arched side entrance to rear garden
- * loss of tree in rear garden
- * pruning of trees and hedges along shared pathway would be required
- * other extensions to The Glebe properties are single storey only
- * overlooking from first floor flank windows in proposed rear extension
- * noise and disturbance from area below roof canopy
- * loss of light to kitchen and garden at No.12 from adjacent roof canopy
- * roof canopy would require removal of existing tree on the boundary
- * would set an undesirable precedent
- * loss of privacy from ground floor flank patio doors
- * property would be wider than others in the terrace
- * provision of en-suite bathroom adjacent to No.12 would cause noise and disturbance (does not require planning permission)
- * overlooking and overshadowing of properties in Prince Consort Drive
- * other disabled residents in the close have not required such extensions or alterations
- * the arboricultural report does not address the tree adjacent to No.12 that would be removed to provide the roof canopy
- * concerns about the extent of the tree removal and pruning which may result in overlooking from properties in Prince Consort Drive.

Comments from Consultees

From a highway point of view, the proposed replacement garage would be of a good size, and although only 4.4m would be provided to the front of the garage, the Council's Highway Engineer raises no objections to the proposals given the location and scale of the development.

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas did not view the proposals.

With regard to tree matters, the proposals would result in some incursions within the Root Protection Areas (RPA's) of neighbouring trees, but this can be dealt with by way of a condition requiring the submission of a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Statement, which should include the pruning back of canopy encroachment.

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
BE11 Conservation Areas
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space
T3 Parking
NE7 Development and Trees

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of Chislehurst Conservation Area and the amenities of nearby residents, and the effect on any important trees on or adjacent to the property.

The proposed two storey side/rear extension would be set back 1.4m from the eastern flank boundary at the front, reducing to 1m at the rear, and would have a lower roofline 0.4m below the main ridge. The ground floor would be set back 0.75m from the front wall of the dwelling whilst the first floor would be set back 2m. Given the position of the property at the far end of this terrace of eight dwellings, the proposed extensions would not appear overly bulky or cramped within the street scene, and are not considered to have a detrimental impact on the character and spatial standards of this part of Chislehurst Conservation Area.

The small front infill extension to the western garage would not detract from the appearance of the dwelling or its neighbouring properties.

The proposed two storey rear extension would project 9.3m to the rear of the main rear wall of the dwelling, but it would be set 10m away from the western flank boundary with the adjoining property at No.12, and approximately 25m away from the rear elevations of properties fronting Prince Consort Drive which have a good level of tree screening in their gardens (three mature lime and sycamore trees within the rear gardens of Nos.12 and 14 Prince Consort Drive are protected by a TPO). Part of the two storey rear extension and the proposed single storey rear infill extension would be set behind adjoining single storey rear extensions to Nos.12 and 13 which have balconies above and a flank screen, and although this may help to reduce the impact on outlook from rear windows at No.12, Members may consider, on balance, that the proposed rear extension would be overly large

in terms of height and depth, and would result in a significant loss of outlook from the adjoining properties in The Glebe and Prince Consort Drive.

With regard to privacy issues, the proposed first floor windows in the western flank elevation facing No.12 would be secondary bedroom and landing windows which can be conditioned to be obscure glazed to prevent overlooking. Ground floor flank doors in the western elevation are far enough away from the adjoining properties not to cause any undue overlooking. Furthermore, the existing privacy screen between the first floor balconies to Nos.12 and 13 would be retained and glass balustrading is proposed to its southern and eastern sides to improve safety.

With regard to the impact on privacy to properties in Prince Consort Drive, the side/rear extension would be set approximately 25m away with good tree screening in between, and the first floor flank windows to a bedroom and bathroom would be obscure glazed. A new clear glazed staircase window would be installed at first floor level in the existing eastern wall of the dwelling, but this is not considered to cause undue overlooking of neighbouring properties.

The proposed ground floor canopy to the rear of the existing dining room adjacent to No.12 would measure 3m x 3m and would have a height of 2.7m with a lantern above. It is not considered to cause any significant harm to the amenities of the adjoining property due to its modest depth and open nature.

The proposals would require the removal of two trees within the back garden of the property, one close to the proposed two storey rear extension, and one adjacent to No.12, and no objections are raised to their loss. The proposals are not considered to have a detrimental impact on important trees on or adjacent to the site, subject to the submission of a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Statement.

In conclusion, the proposals are considered to have a detrimental impact on the outlook from adjoining properties.

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: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed part one/two storey side/rear extension would, by reason of its size, height and excessive depth of rearward projection, have a seriously detrimental impact on the amenities of adjoining residential properties by reason of loss of outlook, and would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.**

You are further informed that :

1 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