

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 16/04897/FULL6

Ward:
Chislehurst

Address : Greycot Willow Grove Chislehurst BR7
5DA

OS Grid Ref: E: 543459 N: 170611

Applicant : Mr & Mrs Alan and Tracey Brown

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing carport, single storey side extension and front boundary wall incorporating piers and railings and automated gate

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 16

Proposal

The application site is a two storey detached property located on the northern side of Willow Grove. The site is not located within a Conservation Area.

Permission is sought for a single storey side extension to form a garage. It will be 10.8m deep and have a maximum width of 3.73m. It will project 2.5m forward of the existing front façade. The existing carport will be removed to accommodate the proposal. The application also includes front boundary walls and electronic gates. The wall will have a maximum height of 1m, with piers and railings resulting in an overall height of 2.111m high.

Consultations

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

- Incorrect boundary line
- Incorrect ownership certificate
- Proximity to the boundary will destroy the separation gap that currently exists between the properties and impact on the character and appearance of the area.
- Side extension will be constructed 1.3-1.5m from the neighbouring elevation and will result in loss of daylight and sunlight
- Increased sense of enclosure

- The proposal is not imaginative or attractive to look at and will not complement the scale, form and layout of adjacent buildings.
- It has no respect for the amenity of Coopers Cob and will be harmful in terms of inadequate daylight, sunlight, privacy and overshadowing
- The application is not accompanied by a written statement describing how the development relates to the wider context.
- Location is an area of low density development characterised by large detached dwellings and directly adjacent to the Chislehurst Conservation Area.
- Contrary to Policy BE1 and H8 of the UDP and the NPPF
- Plot of Greycot is substantially smaller than the adjacent plots and the dwelling has already been extended multiple times and, compared to all other buildings in the neighbourhood, occupies a significantly larger percentage of the plot.
- The dormer, permitted under 16/02670/FULL6, is not shown on the plans. This creates a misleading impression by hiding the overall bulk of the building if this new application is also approved. If approved, will result in an overdevelopment of the plot to the detriment of the overriding character and appearance of the area
- Impact on spatial standards, contrary to Policy H9
- The front elevation of the side extension is not set back from the façade of the main building but protrudes by 2.5m, thereby fails to respect Section 2.2 of the Residential Design Guidance SPG.
- Reduced views through and to vegetation to the rear thereby contrary to Section 2.1 of the Residential Design Guidance SPG.
- Raised issues regarding boundary lines which is a private legal matter and does not fall within the realm of planning considerations.

Comments from the Councils Highways officer can be summarised as follows:

- The proposal includes a good size single garage and there is also other parking on the frontage.
- There are no changes proposed to the access.
- There is currently a high hedge/fence on the frontage and so the wall/railings will not change the sightlines.
- There is a manual gate in place at present and this will be replaced with an automated one. It is set back 5m from the carriageway.
- There may be the potential to improve the sightlines but the proposal is effectively the same as the existing situation and so I would have no objection to the application.

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

BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure

BE13 Development Adjacent to a Conservation Area

H8 Residential Extensions

T3 Parking
T18 Road Safety

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 General Design Principles
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 Residential Design Guidance

London Plan (March 2015)

Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The Council is preparing a Local Plan and commenced a period of consultation on its proposed submission draft of the Local Plan on November 14th 2016 which closes on December 31st 2016 (under The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 as amended). It is anticipated that submission of the draft Local Plan to the Secretary of State will occur in the early part of 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 6 Residential Extensions
Draft Policy 30 Parking
Draft Policy 32 Road Safety
Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

The site has been subject to previous planning applications:

- 86/03223/FUL - Front boundary fence maximum 1.6m high - Permitted 22.01.1987
- 98/02114/FUL - Part one/two storey front and side extension - Permitted 07.10.1998
- 14/03330/PLUD - Single storey rear extension. CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT - Proposed Development is Lawful 22.10.2014
- 16/02670/FULL6 - Extension to rear dormer at first floor and elevational alterations - Permitted 04.08.2016

Conclusions

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- o Design
- o Impact on Neighbouring Properties
- o Highways and Traffic Issues

Principle of Development

The NPPF sets out in paragraph 14 a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of decision-making, the document states that where a development accords with a local plan, applications should be approved without delay. Where a plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

Policy H8 concerning Residential Extensions advises that the scale, form and materials of construction should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with development in the surrounding area, and, space or gaps between buildings should be respected or maintained where these contribute to the character of the area.

The proposed single storey side extension will be 10.8m deep and have a maximum width of 3.73m to form a garage. It will project 2.5m forward of the existing front façade. The existing carport will be removed to accommodate the proposal. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is the property listed. In this location the single storey extension is considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area, car parking and traffic implications and neighbouring amenity.

The proposal also includes replacement front boundary walls and electronic gates. The wall will have a maximum height of 1m, with piers and railings resulting in an overall height of 2.111m high. The site currently benefits from a low front boundary wall with a high hedge and a gate which is set in from the front boundary. The proposed height and style is not considered to detract from the character or appearance of the area within which the site is located therefore the principle of replacement front boundary walls and electronic gates is acceptable subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area and car parking, pedestrian safety and traffic implications.

Design, Siting and Layout.

Policy BE1 states that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout. This includes being imaginative and attractive to look at, compliment the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas; should not detract from existing streetscene and/or landscape.

The existing dwelling is located well within the site and, although the proposed extension projects 2.5m forward, the proposal will be set back a minimum of 11.5m from the front boundary line. From visiting the site it was noted that the existing front porch projects 1.4m from the front elevation and wraps around the property to the east. Furthermore, the existing car port is located forward of the dwelling. This structure will be removed to accommodate the proposal. It is therefore considered

that the proposed front projection is in-keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and will not result in a significant impact on the street scene.

The extension will be 3.73m wide. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on spatial standards and lack of side space. Policy H9 requires a minimum of 1m for developments of two or more stories therefore is not relevant to this application. The proposed extension will be single storey and will be located close to the flank boundary however it is not considered to result in a detrimental impact on the spatial standards of the area. As it is single storey only, the proposed extension is not considered to result in a cramped appearance or unrelated terracing.

With regards to the replacement front boundary wall and gates, Policy BE7 concerning Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure advises that the Council will:

- (i) seek to ensure the retention of railings, walls, plantings and hedgerows of native species and other means of enclosure where they form an important feature of the streetscape; and
- (ii) resist the construction or erection of high or inappropriate enclosures where such boundary enclosures would erode the open nature of the area, or would adversely impact on local townscape character.

The proposed replacement front boundary walls and electronic gates will have a similar footprint as the existing. With regards to the character of the area, the site has an existing low wall and high hedge. It is considered that the change in materials is acceptable and will not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the host property or the street scene in general. From visiting the site it was noted that the neighbouring property to the west, Coopers Cob, has similar existing front boundary walls and gates however does not benefit from planning permission therefore cannot be used to set a precedent.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

Policy BE1 in the Adopted UDP states that the development should respect the amenity of occupiers of future occupants and should also respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing.

The topography of the site is such that it slopes down from west to east, with the neighbouring property, Coopers Cob, higher than the application site. Concerns have been raised regarding the proximity to the boundary and the neighbouring property. The proposed plans indicate that the extension will be located 0.1-0.5m from the flank boundary. The roof of the proposed extension will be dual pitched, with an eaves height of 2.8m and a maximum height of 4.8m. Given the topography of the site, the proposed extension is not considered to result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property, Coopers Cob, with regards to loss of outlook or visual amenity. Furthermore, the proposed flank elevation is blank therefore it is not considered to impact on current privacy levels.

Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the level of daylight and sunlight to the flank windows of the neighbouring property to the west, Coopers Cob. The neighbouring property has an integral garage located close to this flank boundary. The flank windows in the flank elevation of Coopers Cob appear to serve the garage, a bathroom and a utility room. As these are not considered habitable rooms, the impact on daylight and sunlight to these rooms is not considered significant to warrant refusal of the application.

It has been raised that the boundary lines indicated on the plans is incorrect and that the proposed extension will be on land owned by the occupiers of Coopers Cob. It has been confirmed by the applicant that the correct information has been submitted. However this is a private legal matter as to who owns the land and whether development can proceed.

The proposed extension will be located to the west of the application site, projecting 2.5m to the front. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension will not impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property to the east, Summerfield.

The proposed front boundary treatment is not considered to impact on the amenities of either neighbouring property, over and above that already existing.

Highways

Willow Grove is a Local Distributor Road. The site has a very low PTAL score of 1a (on a scale of 1 - 6, where 6 is the most accessible). The proposal includes a garage (3.3m wide x 7.117m deep), turning space on the frontage and replacement front boundary walls and electronic gate.

The proposed side extension will form a garage, thereby creating additional secure parking. The extension will project forward into the existing driveway by 2.5m however the existing hardstanding is large and provides sufficient parking and turning space therefore the extension is not considered to impact on the current level of off-street parking.

The proposed front boundary wall will have a maximum height of 1m, with piers and railings resulting in an overall height of 2.111m high, to replace the existing high hedge and wall. It is therefore considered that the proposal will not alter the existing sightlines. Furthermore, the gate is set back 5m from the carriageway therefore the vehicles entering/leaving the site will not impact on the traffic flow. It is therefore considered that the proposed electronic gate would be acceptable and would not result in a significant impact on highway safety. As such, no objection was raised from the Councils Highways Officer.

Summary

Having had regard to the above it was considered that, on balance, the siting, size and design of the proposed extension is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents or impact detrimentally on the

character of the area. Furthermore, the proposed front boundary walls and gates are not considered to impact on highways safety.

as amended by documents received on 18.11.2016

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 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and / or drawings unless otherwise 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 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.