

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

**Application No :** 17/02900/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Chislehurst**

**Address :** 59 White Horse Hill, Chislehurst, BR7  
6DQ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 543338 N: 171359

**Applicant :** Mr D. McMahon

**Objections : NO**

**Description of Development:**

First floor rear extension and elevational alterations.

Key designations:

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

**Description of Development:**

The proposed first floor extension will have a rear projection of 4.9m and a width of 4.1m, with a tapered rear wall (width reduced from 5.4m previously proposed under ref. 17/01096). The roof will be flat with a maximum height of 5.7m (previously sloped to the same height), matching the height of the eaves of the main dwelling. The extension will be sited on top of the existing flat roofed single storey rear extension and will provide an additional bedroom.

Elevational alterations include changes to the ground floor flank and rear windows.

**Location**

The site is located on the western side of White Horse Hill and comprises an end of terrace two storey residential dwelling. The wider area is characterised by similar residential development.

**Comments from Local Residents**

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

- The development will enhance the back of the house and terrace and will be a refreshing and exciting design that works with and not against the Victorian history of the houses on the terrace.

## **Consultations**

None.

## **Planning Considerations**

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following:

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

The NPPF confirms that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### Chapter 7 - Requiring Good Design

### The London Plan (2015)

Policy 7.4 Local Character  
Policy 7.6 Architecture

### Unitary Development Plan (2006)

BE1 Design of New Development  
H8 Residential Extensions

### Other Guidance

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

Supplementary Planning Guidance – The Chislehurst Conservation Area

### 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 6 – Residential Extensions  
Draft Policy 37 - General Design of Development

## **Planning History**

Planning permission was refused under ref. 17/01096 for a first floor rear extension and elevational alterations. The refusal grounds were as follows:

‘The proposed extension, by reason of its design, siting and excessive rear projection, would result in a detrimental impact on the amenities of No. 61 White Horse Hill by way of loss of outlook, a tunnelling visual impact and loss of light,

thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies 6 and 37 of the Emerging Local Plan.'

Planning permission was refused under ref. 08/01222 for a single storey rear extension. The refusal grounds were as follows:

'The proposal, by reason of its location on an existing rear extension, would be detrimental to the amenities that the occupiers of 57, White Horse Hill might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy by reason of visual impact, loss of prospect and loss of light in view of the depth of rearward projection.'

## **Conclusion**

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.

Following the refusal of application ref. 17/01096, the proposal seeks to alter the design by reducing the width from 5.4m to 4.1m. This results in a separation of the flank wall from the shared boundary with No. 61 of 1.3m. The roof will be flat as opposed to the previously considered sloped roof, however the height of 5.7m at the point closest to No. 61 would remain as previously proposed.

## Design and Character

Design is a key consideration in the planning process. Good design is an important aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The NPPF states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

London Plan and UDP policies further reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality design.

The proposed extension has a modern angled design that, whilst different to the architecture of the host building, would complement it without dominating the building. The extension will be sited to the rear of the house and would not be visible from the highway. It is considered on balance that the proposed extension would not impact harmfully on the character of the area and indeed this view when considering application ref. 17/01096.

## Impact on neighbouring amenities

Policy BE1 of the UDP seeks to protect existing residential occupiers from inappropriate development. Issues to consider are the impact of a development proposal upon neighbouring properties by way of overshadowing, loss of light, overbearing impact, overlooking, loss of privacy and general noise and disturbance.

The proposal would present a vertical flank wall of 4.9m in length in close proximity to the flank boundary adjoining No. 61. This relationship was considered unacceptable under ref. 17/01096 however the current application is submitted in accompaniment with a similar proposal at No. 61 (ref. 17/03240). The construction of both extensions together is considered to adequately address the previous concerns regarding oppressive visual impact, loss of outlook and loss of light to No. 61, which is sited to the

north. The previous concerns in terms of tunnelling would be addressed by the proposed neighbouring first floor extension, with only a first floor bathroom window affected.

It is considered that on balance the proposal would not have a significant impact on the amenities of No. 61, provided that both extensions are constructed together. An appropriate condition is recommended to ensure this, and Members are asked to consider the pertinence of this condition in light of the intention of both property owners to construct both developments in the future.

To the south, No 57 would not suffer a loss of light and has a separation from the site of 3.5m that would avoid significant visual impact. The slope of the proposed roof will also reduce the bulk of the development facing No. 57 and this would mitigate the impact of the extension.

### Summary

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents and would not impact detrimentally on the character of the area. It is therefore recommended that Members grant planning permission.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file refs. 17/01096, 17/02900 and 17/03240 set out in the Planning History section above, 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 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.**

- 4 No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the flank elevation(s) of the**

**extension hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.**

**Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.**

**5 The developments permitted at Nos. 59 and 61 under refs. 17/02900 and 17/03240 shall be constructed simultaneously.**

**Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to preserve the residential amenities of both properties.**