

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 15/05493/FULL6

Ward:
Chislehurst

Address : 78 Walden Road Chislehurst BR7 5DL

OS Grid Ref: E: 542628 N: 170980

Applicant : Mrs Negar Shooshtarian

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part 1/2 storey front, rear and side extensions. Conversion of garage into habitable room with elevational alterations.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 10

Proposal

The application seeks permission for a part one/two storey front, rear and side extension, the conversion of garage into habitable room and elevational alterations.

The part one/two storey rear extension would project 5m to the rear at ground floor level and 3m at first floor level. The extension would wrap around the side and front of the property at first floor level with the addition of a first floor extension above the existing side and front single storey elements.

Location

The application site is a two storey detached property located on the northern side of Walden Road, close to the junction with Elmstead Glade. The site is not located within a conservation area, nor is it listed.

Consultations

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

- o Plans do not show any measurement scales so hard to assess impact on light and privacy
- o Development grossly out of proportion to the original property and subsequently neighbouring properties.
- o Concerns over lack of parking provision.

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

The application site has no previous planning history.

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 application site was visited by the case officer and the aims and objectives of the above policies, national and regional planning guidance, all other material planning considerations including any objections, other representations and relevant planning history on the site were taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

The part one/two storey rear extension would project 5m to the rear at ground floor level and 3m at first floor level. The extension would wrap around the side and front of the property at first floor level with the addition of a first floor extension above the existing side and front single storey elements.

Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan requires a minimum distance of 1m side space to be provided for two storey developments. The proposal would provide a side space in excess of 1m to both flank boundaries and as such would be considered to comply with Policy H9.

Additional information was submitted on 15/2/2016 which shows that the proposed first floor element would not project within the 45 degree line of the middle of the first floor rear windows of the adjoining properties. The ground floor element would however still be considered to be excessive in depth at the rear, particularly given the property is already set back slightly from that of No.80. Whilst the applicant has stated there are other similar proposals in the street that project 3.5m to the rear at two storey level, the other sites do not appear to project beyond the rear of the neighbouring dwellings to the extent of the proposal at the application site, and do not feature a single storey extension that projects beyond the two storey element. The addition of the rear extension is therefore considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties, in particular No.80.

It is noted that the proposed flank wall of the host dwelling facing No.80 would only include one small obscure glazed window and is unlikely to result in a significant

loss of privacy to No.80, particularly given that the facing flank wall of No.80 is blank.

Revised plans were submitted on the 15/2/2016 which amended the proposed roof at the rear of the property from a gable end to a hipped roof to reduce the increase in bulk of the proposal. Whilst this has been achieved to a degree the proposal is still considered to result in a large increase in bulk and would be an incongruous addition to the host dwelling, especially given the depth of the rear projection.

The proposal includes a gable end to the front of the property and there are other similar examples of this within the street such as at No.64. Furthermore there are some examples of white rendered properties close to the application site. The extension would project 1m further to the front at first floor level and would match the footprint of the existing single storey front element. On balance, the proposed design of the extension would not be considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the wider streetscene.

The proposal includes the conversion of garage to habitable space, which would result in the loss of one parking space. Highways Officers raised no objection to the proposal on the basis that the site's curtilage would be utilised for parking.

The addition of the proposed part one/two storey rear, side and front extension would result in a large increase in the bulk, scale and massing of the house and is considered to be excessive in its rearward projection.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would result in a loss of amenity to local residents.

as amended by documents received on 15.02.2016

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed extension by reason of its excessive depth and bulk would result in an over dominant and incongruous addition to the host dwelling, harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the residential amenities of the adjoining dwelling, contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.**