

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

**Application No :** 17/01880/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Chislehurst**

**Address :** 32 Highfield Road Chislehurst BR7 6QZ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 545873 N: 168894

**Applicant :** Mr Thomas Knudsen

**Objections : YES**

### **Description of Development:**

First floor side and single storey front and rear extensions

### **Key designations:**

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Smoke Control SCA 17

### **Proposal**

The application proposes two single storey front extensions; to the West of the site the extension would have a depth of 1m by a width of 2.1m and a height of 2.8m.

To the East of the site the garage will be replaced by a double garage that would have a maximum width of 6.4m, a minimum width of 3.7m and a depth of 6.9m. It would have an eaves height of 2.4m and a ridge height of 3.5m

The rear extension would have a depth of 6.3m and a width of 8.5m; it would have an eaves height of 2.4m and a ridge height of 3.5m

The first floor side extension would have a width of 3.7m and a depth of 9.2m eaves height of 4.9m and a ridge height of 7.5m.

The application site hosts a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the Southern side of Highfield Road, Chislehurst.

### **Consultations**

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

- o Total area of extensions appears larger than the house
- o Double garage is out of character
- o Concern regarding tall roof of the garage
- o Loss of views which would be obstructed by the garage
- o Concern regarding damage to fence on the boundary
- o Garage would impact street scene
- o Loss of tree which adds value to the street scene
- o Very severe front building line

Following these objections revised plans were submitted which reduced the height of the garage and neighbours were reconsulted and further comments were received which can be summarised as follows:

- o Garage still protrudes too far
- o Trees and shrubs will be removed to make way for the development

Highways raised no objections.

### **Planning Considerations**

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

BE1 Design of New Development  
H8 Residential Extensions  
H9 Side Space

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 8 Side Space  
Draft Policy 37 General Design of Development

The Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) documents are also a consideration in the determination of planning applications. These are:

SPG No1 - General Design Principles  
SPG No2 - Residential Design Guidance

Planning History

84/03061/FUL; GARDEN SHED SEMI-DETACHED HOUSE SECTION 32  
APPLICATION; Permitted; 10.01.1985

### **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 adjoining dwelling at number 30 benefits from a rear extension that is approximately 3m in depth, the rear extension nearest this boundary would project 6.3m, therefore a further 3.3m past the rear building line of number 30, it is set in from the boundary slightly and the roof pitches away from the boundary it is therefore considered that on balance this would be acceptable. The dwelling at number 34 projects approximately 3m from the rearmost wall of number 32 and given that the projection at this side would be 4.5m and significantly set in from the boundary this would be considered to be acceptable.

The property currently benefits from a front extension which does not match that of number 30 and as such it is considered that the alterations to the front would in principle have no impact on the character and appearance of the pair of semis. The proposed garage would project 2m past the existing front extension and given that the properties are somewhat set back from the main street and due to matching materials being proposed it is considered that on balance the front extension would not cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.

Given the projection of the existing front extension it is considered that the new double garage would have no more significant impact on the adjoining occupiers at number 34

than the existing garage, and it is set significantly away from number 30 to have no impact on this adjoining occupier.

The front extension to the other side of the site has a minimal projection of 1m and as such would have no significant impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers nor the street scene.

The side extension would be 1m from the side boundary and as such would comply with Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and would reduce the opportunity for unrelated terracing. There is one window in the side elevation which is proposed to be obscure glazed as it serves a bathroom.

The adjoining occupiers of number 34 benefit from two ground floor windows and no first floor windows, it is considered that, especially given the orientation of the properties there would be no significant impact on the outlook, light and amenity of the adjoining occupiers of number 34 in relation to the first floor side extension.

The extension is set away from the boundary with number 30 by 8.5m and as such there would be no significant impact on this adjoining occupier.

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 adjoining residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 17/01880/FULL6 and any other applications on the site 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 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.**

