

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

**Application No :** 17/02441/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Chislehurst**

**Address :** Wengen Elmstead Lane Chislehurst  
BR7 5EQ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 542443 N: 170989

**Applicant :** Mrs C Mulock

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Part one/ two storey front extension and single storey rear extension.

**Key designations:**

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

**Proposal**

The proposal seeks to amend a previous permission granted under ref. 16/04213/FULL6 for a part one/two storey front and single storey rear extensions. The proposed amendments involve the following:

- Increase in height of 0.25m of the main ridge height
- Increase in height of the first floor front dormer extension of 1m

As in the previously permitted scheme roof alteration are proposed which would incorporate replacing the existing gable ended roof with a hipped roof, however the current proposal would also involve an increase in the main ridge height from 7.75m to 8m.

The proposal involves a two storey front extension which would square off the front elevation at ground floor, would have a width of 5.8m at first floor, and would have a forward projection of 2.6m. This element would have a pitched roof which would be hipped and would have a maximum height of 7.8m.

To the southern side of the front elevation, a front dormer is proposed which would have a width of 3.8m and a pitched roof which would be hipped and would have a height of 4.5m, matching the extended ridge height of the main roof (8m in height)

A single storey rear extension is also proposed which would have a rearward projection of 4m, a width of 10.7m and it would be set back 1m from the north flank. The proposed rear extension would have a flat roof with a height of 3.2m and would incorporate two lantern rooflights with a maximum height of 3.8m.

## Location

The site hosts a detached dwelling which is situated on the western side of Elmstead Lane, not far from the junction with Walden Road. The site is not on any designated land.

## Consultations

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

- Existing side windows have already been removed and they would like these replaced life for like, in terms of position, design and openings and should be obscured glazed
- Proposed side window in rear extension is north facing so not required for light, would like for this side window to be removed from proposal as it will look directly into the properties and gardens of No.1 and 2 Walden End including habitable room (office) of No. 2 Walden End
- Contravenes planning policy and right to privacy
- There is no adequate screening as fence drops in height at this point
- Concerned of the overall height of the building will be raised
- No annotations or dimensions on drawings
- Building has been demolished and concern is that existing building levels will not be maintained
- Any additional height to eaves will result in loss of light and adverse impact on their property
- No right of light drawings or studies of impact on neighbouring amenity have been provided
- If height is increase, windows will be at a higher level and this would not be in accordance with previous or present submission
- new steel frame at rear has been constructed and is very high
- Windows at higher level will greatly increase issues of over-looking and loss of privacy
- Issue of residential amenity for No. 2 Walden End will also be important
- Will appear overdominant
- Out of scale with the plot
- Inaccuracy of application as form states works have not commenced which is false
- House has been practically demolished
- Extent of works will make it difficult for any site visits to appreciate the original property and context
- Shrubbery on both sides of boundaries have been removed, removing any screening
- Site plans are inaccurate and out of date for nos. 1 and 2 Walden End
- Even more important if increasing height of the building
- Current elevations are incorrect
- Revisions are not noted on plans

- Misleading layout and room naming on plans as rear extension is listed as an orangery, clearly not an orangery as it involves a kitchen and it is a habitable room. This point was made by Planning Inspector in the dismissed appeal in 2016
- Want to ensure that the applicant follows correct planning laws during construction

#### Consultee Comments

No technical Highways objections.

#### **Planning Considerations**

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

BE1 Design of New Development  
 H8 Residential Extensions  
 H9 Side Space  
 NE7 Development and trees

#### Emerging Local Plan

The Council is preparing a Local Plan. The submission of the Draft Local Plan was made to Secretary of State on 11th August 2017. These documents are a material consideration. The weight attached to the draft policies increases as the Local Plan process advances.

Draft Policy 37 - General Design of Development  
 Draft Policy 6 - Residential Extensions  
 Draft Policy 8 - Side Space  
 Draft Policy 32 - Road Safety  
 Draft Policy 73 - Development and Trees

#### NPPF

Chapter 7 - Requiring Good Design

#### London Plan

Policy 7.4 - Local Character  
 Policy 7.6 - Architecture

#### **Planning History**

Planning permission was granted under ref. 89/03126 for formation of a pitched roof over front and rear dormer extension

Planning permission was refused under ref. 16/02905 for part one/two storey front and single storey rear extensions. The reason for refusal was as follows:

'1 The proposed rear extension, by reason of its depth of substantial rearward projection, height and proximity to the flank boundary of the site, would result in an overbearing visual impact and tunnelling effect on the rear ground floor window and outdoor amenity space of 1 Walden end Elmstead lane and would result in a overshadowing and a harmful loss of residential amenities to this neighbouring property, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.'

Planning permission was granted under ref. 16/04213 for part one/two storey front and single storey rear extensions.

## **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 re-submitted proposal remains the same as the previously permitted scheme under ref. 16/04213 with regards to the single storey rear extension and overall footprint of the development, therefore the principle of this element of the proposal has previously been established. The extensions will have the same depth (4m in rear projection and 2.6m from the front elevation) and eaves height (5m) as the previously permitted application (ref. 16/04213).

Therefore, in this case, careful consideration is required to assess whether the proposed increase in height of the main ridge (by 0.25m) and front dormer extension (by 1m) would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area, the appearance of the host dwelling or the amenity of local neighbouring residents.

Policy H8 relates to residential extensions and states that these should complement the scale, form and materials of the host dwelling and the surrounding development. It further elaborated in the written statement that 'dormer extensions into prominent roof slopes and extensions above the existing ridgeline will not normally be permitted.'

In contrast to the previously granted scheme (ref. 16/04213), the proposal would now involve an increase in height of the existing ridge from 7.75m to 8m. The increase in height is not considered significant (0.25m) and the existing property is stepped down in height compared to the neighbouring dwellings either side of the site. As a result, and given that it is only a limited increase in ridgeline, it is not considered that it would appear overly prominent or conspicuous in the street scene and would not impact detrimentally on the appearance of the host dwelling or the character of the local area.

The width and siting of the proposed front dormer would remain the same as the previously granted proposal and therefore, in this current proposal careful consideration needs to be given to the impact of increase in height of from 3.5m to 4.5m on local character and the amenities of the neighbouring dwellings. The increased height would result in the front dormer matching the main ridge height (also increase by 0.25m) which would result in more of an appearance of the first floor extension, however it would still be set back by 0.6m from the two storey front

extension to the north of the front elevation, therefore retaining a level of subservience. In addition, the front dormer would also be set in 0.6m from the flank, and it would therefore visually retain the appearance of the front catslide roof. It would result in the proposed front dormer having a more top heavy appearance. However, on balance, and given the above, it is not considered that this would have a significantly harmful impact on the appearance of the host dwelling or the visual amenity of the area to an extent which would warrant the refusal of the current proposal.

As for the impact of these revisions on the amenities of local residents, the eaves height and depth of the proposed extension will remain the same as the previously granted application under ref. 16/04213. The increase in ridge height is limited and would be set far back from the site boundaries given the hipped roof profile. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposal would have any significant additional impact in terms of loss of daylight and visual impact than the extension already permitted.

From a Highways point of view, the highways aspects of the proposal remain the same as the previously permitted application under ref. 16/04213. The garage is remaining and parking for 2 to 3 vehicles is to be provided on the site frontage. The Council's Highways Engineer has not raised any objections to the proposal.

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

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 17/02441, excluding exempt information.

## **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.**