

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

**Application No :** 16/04580/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Bromley Common And  
Keston**

**Address :** 309 Southborough Lane, Bromley  
BR2 8BG

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 543203 N: 167704

**Applicant :** Mr Chrysostomou

**Objections :** No

**Description of Development:**

First floor side/rear extension and single storey front and rear extensions

**Key designations:**

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Smoke Control SCA 12  
Smoke Control SCA 13

**Proposal**

The application seeks consent for the construction of a first floor side/rear wrap around extension and single-storey front and rear extension.

The proposed single storey rear extension would measure 4m in depth and would have span the width of the dwelling. It would have a flat roof with a height of 3.3m at eaves level. It would incorporate a glazed lantern and at its maximum point it would measure 4m. The proposal would also include a 1m front extension, which would sit forward of the existing side extension and would include a pitched roof, which partially wraps around the front elevation.

The proposed first floor side/rear extension would have a depth of 5.6m; include a 3m rearward projection. The side element is set 5.7m back from the front elevation and wraps around the rear elevation of the property. The proposal would include a flat roof and would sit above the side and rear ground floor additions.

**Location**

The application relates to a two-storey semi-detached residential dwelling, which is located on the north east side of Southborough Lane. The property benefits from an existing single-storey rear conservatory and a dormer roof extension.

**Consultations**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

## **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

SPG 1 General Design Principles  
SPG 2 Residential Design Guidance

## **Planning History**

93/00612/FUL - Single storey side and rear extension. Permission 12.05.1993

98/00055/FUL - Gable end extension to roof and rear dormer. Permission 04.03.1998

04/00790/FULL6 - Single storey rear extension. Permission 07.04.2004

## **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 proposed front extension is considered to be modest alteration and is generally of a scale, form and design which respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It is noted from the officer site visit that a number of other properties along Southborough Lane benefit from single-storey front extensions. In this case, the proposal would not appear out of the character and generally compliments existing development. It is also noted that a small front extension has recently been granted permission at No 307 Southborough Lane under reference DC/16/00562.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would not be visible from the streetscene. Similar sized extensions are noted on neighbouring properties, including the adjoining neighbour at No 311. The size, scale and design of the rear extension is considered to be compatible with surrounding development and would generally respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling. A similar size extension has recently been approved under DC/16/00562 at No 307 and in this context the proposal is considered to be an acceptable alteration, which accords with policies BE1 and H8 of the UDP.

The application also seeks consent for the construction of a first floor side/rear extension, which wraps around the rear of the property. Policy H9 states that 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 case, the first floor element of the scheme would be set 1m away from the boundary but would be set above and existing side extension, which extends up to the boundary. The proposal would therefore fail to achieve a minimum set-back for the 'full height and length of the flank wall of the building'.

Paragraph 4.48 of Policy H9 states that 'the retention of space around residential buildings is essential to ensure adequate separation and to safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents. It is important to prevent a cramped appearance and unrelated terracing from occurring. It is also necessary to protect the high spatial standards and level of visual amenity which characterise many of the Borough's residential areas'.

In this case the proposed first floor side/rear extension would be set back 5.7m from the front elevation and would retain a 1m separation from the boundary. When viewed from the front, this element would appear subservient and not overly prominent. However, it would incorporate a flat roof, which sits slightly above the eaves of the main dwelling. Whilst first floor side and rear extensions are noted on a number of other properties within the wider locality, similar flat roof extensions are less common and are not found within the immediate vicinity. However, first floor dormer extensions are noted on the cat-slide roof properties opposite the site. Paragraph 4.44 of Policy H8 states that 'flat roof side extensions of two or more storeys to dwellings of traditional roof design will normally be resisted unless the extension is set well back from the building line and is unobtrusive'. Given the set back from the front elevation, Members may consider that the proposal would appear sufficiently subservient and unobtrusive and would not therefore result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or streetscene.

In respect of neighbouring amenity the main impact would be on the immediate neighbouring occupiers.

No 311 is located to the south east of the application site and benefits from a single-storey rear extension. The proposed ground floor rear extension would abut the common side boundary for a depth of 4m but would not project beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring development. The proposed first floor rear extension would measure 3m in depth and would be set away from the side boundary by 3m. It is considered that the ground neighbouring floor extension would however mitigate any significant visual harm from the bulk of the proposals. The size of the rear garden and openness of land to the rear of the gardens would prevent an unacceptable sense of enclosure and loss of light. The impact on the visual amenities of No 311 is therefore considered to be acceptable.

No 307 is located to the north west of the application property. At the time of the case officer's site visit it appeared works were being carried out to the property and it is noted that planning permission was granted under DC/16/00562 for the construction of a rear extension measuring 4m in depth. Whilst this is not currently in place, a dormer extension has been erected and it appears an existing conservatory has recently been demolished. It is therefore considered that there is a reasonable prospect of this development coming forward. The proposed ground floor extension would abut the common side boundary with this property, however the depth would be similar to the recently approved neighbouring extension and this would effectively mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development. Similarly, the proposed first floor extension would measure 3m in depth from the rear of the existing elevation and would be set 1m away from the common boundary. It is noted that the neighbouring proposal also includes a proposed side extension which spans the full depth of the property. The proposal is not

considered to be overly dominant and is set back from the front elevation. Whilst the location and orientation of the site may result in some overshadowing this is not considered sufficient to warrant a refusal when taking into account the overshadowing caused by the height of the existing property, size of the rear garden and neighbouring proposal. No objections have been received from this neighbour and on balance, it is considered that the impact on the visual amenities of No 307 would be acceptable.

In respect of privacy there is an established degree of overlooking towards the rear of the site. The design of the extensions and fenestration arrangement would not result in a level of overlooking which is significantly worse than the current situation.

Given the above, Members may consider that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenities and permission should be granted.

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

**REASON: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.**

- 2 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.**

**REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.**

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.**