

Committee Date	24.06.2021	
Address	29 Grove Vale Chislehurst BR7 5DS	
Application Number	21/00524/FULL6	Officer - Suzanne Lyon
Ward	Chislehurst	
Proposal	Single storey front/side and part one/two storey rear extensions, new vehicular access and hard standing	
Applicant	Adam Cook	Agent
		Mr O Newell
29 Grove Vale Chislehurst BR7 5DS	Summit Architecture 3 Blackborough House 23 Beatrice Court Buckhurst Hill IG9 6EA	
Reason for referral to committee	Call-in	Councillor call in Yes

RECOMMENDATION	Application Permitted
-----------------------	-----------------------

KEY DESIGNATIONS

- **Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area**
- **London City Airport Safeguarding**
- **Smoke Control SCA 16**
- **TPO**

Vehicle parking	Existing number of spaces	Total proposed including spaces retained	Difference in spaces (+ or -)
Standard car spaces	2	2	0
Disabled car spaces	0	0	0
Cycle	0	0	0

Representation summary	Neighbour letters were sent 16.02.21
Total number of responses	13
Number in support	3
Number of objections	10

1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- No unacceptable impact would arise to neighbouring occupiers; and
- No unacceptable Highways impacts would arise

2 LOCATION

2.1 The application site is a two storey detached property located on the eastern side of Grove Vale, close to the junction with Walden Road. Grove Vale is a cul-de-sac of 30 properties.



3 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Permission is sought for a single storey front/side and part one/two storey rear extensions, new vehicular access and hard standing.
- 3.2 The proposed single storey front extension will project 1m forward to replace the existing porch and will be 8.7m wide. The side extension will project 2.5m from the flank elevation and will have a total depth of 13.6m, projecting 6m beyond the rear. It will then wrap around the property at the rear and will be 10.3m wide. At first floor level, the extension will project 4.95m from the rear elevation and will be 9.3m wide, projecting 1.5m beyond the existing flank elevation.
- 3.3 This application has been 'called-in' by ward Councillors.

4 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1 There is no relevant planning history relating to the application site.

5 CONSULTATION SUMMARY

A) Statutory - N/A

B) Local Groups - N/A

C) Adjoining Occupiers (summary)

- Objections**

- Design - **points addressed in paragraph 7.2**
 - Not in keeping with area and will detract from the present character of Grove Vale
 - Unsightly
 - The depth of the new double storey rear extension appears to be about six metres, which is similar to No28 next door, whose single storey application was refused on 19th February; so the precedent has been set.
 - Impact on neighbouring amenity - **points addressed in paragraph 7.3**
 - Loss of privacy
 - Should provide screening
 - Loss of daylight and sunlight
 - Angle of gardens increase impact
 - The excessive height, width, depth and roof height will have a detrimental impact by way of over shadowing, loss of day and sunlight, outlook, privacy, enjoyment, health and wellbeing
 - Unclear if it complies with 45 degree rule
 - Loss of outlook
 - Impact on natural drainage
 - Increase risk of flooding and subsidence

- The covenant to our deeds says we have the right to light. The excessive planned extension for no 29 takes away our light from our home.
- Trees - **points addressed in paragraph 7.4**
 - Trees at rear have been removed
 - Front hedge has been removed
- Other
 - Works have already started
 - No site notice
 - Damage to grass verges, and road and pavements have been blocked
 - Impact property value
- Support
 - In character with the street
 - Heights could be achievable by permitted development
 - Significant distance from proposal and the rear of the houses on Selby Road so no privacy issues
 - Most houses have been extended by way of a two storey extension and maintained very good distance from the houses on Selby Road as gardens are all of a similar generous length
 - South easterly facing gardens, therefore loss of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing is not an issue
 - Damaged grass verges are not a planning matter
 - No.28 is not a corner plot or on an angled position, the garden projects in a different direction to that of its house, which is not uncommon.
 - The 45 degree line has been respected
 - No proposal to remove protected trees in order to fulfil the proposal
 - The loss of value of ones home is not a planning matter
 - Sympathetic of surrounding area, with materials to match the existing house
 - First floor has been set back and set in, allowing at least 1m between boundaries
 - Roof is flat and set lower than the existing roof, so claims of overshadowing, loss of sunlight, daylight and privacy would appear unsubstantiated
 - Windows appear either obscure or facing away from neighbours

Please note the above is a summary of the material planning considerations and the full text is available on the council's website.

6 POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

- 6.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-
- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,

- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
 - (c) any other material considerations.
- 6.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.3 The development plan for Bromley comprises the Bromley Local Plan (Jan 2019) and the London Plan (March 2021). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.
- 6.4 The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies:

6.5 The London Plan

D1 London's form and characteristics
D4 Delivering good design
D5 Inclusive design

6.6 Bromley Local Plan 2019

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

6.7 Bromley Supplementary Guidance

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

7 ASSESSMENT

7.1 Design – Layout, scale – Acceptable

- 7.1.1 The proposed single storey front extension will project 1m forward to replace the existing porch and will be 8.7m wide. The proposed side extension will project 2.5m from the flank elevation and will have a total depth of 13.6m, projecting 6m beyond the rear. It will then wrap around the property at the rear and will be 10.3m wide. At first floor level, the extension will project 4.95m from the rear elevation and will be 9.3m wide, projecting 1.5m beyond the existing flank elevation. The existing garage will be removed to accommodate the proposal.
- 7.1.2 The single storey front/side extension will incorporate a continuous pitched roof at the front which is considered sympathetic to the host property. Given the modest forward projection, it is considered that this element would not result in

a significant impact on the character of the surrounding area or street scene in generally.

- 7.1.3 The proposed two storey rear extension projects 1.5m beyond the flank elevation therefore will be visible from Grove Vale, however it is set back approximately 6.3m from the front elevation. The proposal incorporates a hipped roof that is set down from the main ridge which is considered subservient to the main house. The introduction of a hipped roof to the rear of the house is considered to suit the architecture of the dwelling and the surrounding properties. The bulk and scale of the extension would not appear excessive due to the modest roof design and set back, despite the large footprint. Furthermore, the finishing materials are indicated to match the existing property.
- 7.1.4 Policy 8 requires a minimum of 1m space from the side boundary of the site be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building to prevent extensions which would be harmful to the spatial standards of its residential areas and an unrelated terracing effect. This is expected for the full height and length of the flank wall including any existing ground floor aspect. In order to prevent a cramped appearance which can lead to unrelated terracing and to safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring property. The policy also states that where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space. The proposed ground floor extension would extend up to the flank boundary and the proposed first floor extension would be set in 1m from the flank boundary. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed extension would not be offset from the boundary for the full height and length of the development, the first floor flank wall would provide 1m side space to the flank boundary and is set back 6.3m from the front elevation. On balance, the proposal is considered compliant with Policy 8 as it maintains 1m separation at first floor level and would not lead to unrelated terracing.
- 7.1.5 Having regard to the form, scale, siting and proposed materials it is considered that the proposed extension(s) would complement the host property and would not appear out of character with surrounding development or the area generally.

7.2 Residential Amenity – Acceptable

- 7.2.1 The proposed single storey side extension will be located along the southern flank boundary. It will replace the existing garage located within the rear garden and will project an additional 1m beyond the front elevation. It is noted that the neighbouring property to the south, No.30, has an existing side garage extension. This single storey front element will be set in approximately 4.5m from the northern flank boundary with No.28. Given the scale and separation, the single storey extensions are not considered to adversely impact on the amenities of either neighbouring property with regards to loss of light, outlook or privacy.
- 7.2.2 At the rear, the proposed extension will project 6m beyond the rear elevation at ground floor level, and 4.95m at first floor level. It will project 1.5m beyond the

existing flank elevation, providing 1m separation to the southern flank boundary. It is noted that No.30 has been subject to a two storey side/rear extension under planning ref. 14/02728/FUL6, which is 3.5m deep. It is set in approximately 2.5m from the shared flank boundary. The orientation of the site is such that this neighbouring property is located to the south of the site. The 45 degree line was established and 0.5m of the first floor extension was within 45 degrees of closest habitable room window of No.30. However given the separation and orientation, this is not considered to result in a significant impact on the amenities of this habitable room with regards to loss of light, outlook or visual amenity, to warrant refusal on this basis. One first floor flank window is proposed which will serve an en-suite, it is indicated to be obscure glazed therefore it is not considered to impact significantly on the current privacy levels.

- 7.2.3 With regards to the neighbouring property to the north, No.28, the proposed extension will be 6m deep at ground floor level and 4.95m at first floor level. Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on this neighbouring property, including loss of light, outlook and privacy. No.28 is situated directly to the north of the application site. The shared flank boundary line tapers in to the application site towards the rear. As such the proposal will provide 1.5m - 3m separation to the shared boundary and approximately 4m between properties. It is noted that the original two storey rear elevation of this neighbouring property projects approximately 1m further to the rear and has an existing rear conservatory that is approximately 5m deep. Given the shape and siting of this neighbouring property within its plot the proposed ground floor extension will result in a similar depth to the neighbouring conservatory. It is also noted that this neighbouring property has been subject to a recent permission for a single storey rear extension under planning ref. 20/04214/FULL6, with a maximum depth of 5.6m when viewed from No.29, however the works have not yet commenced. With regards to the first floor level, the proposal will project 4.95m to the rear. The 45 degree line was established and no part of the first floor extension was within 45 degrees of the rear habitable windows of No.28. As such, the proposal is not considered to result in a significant impact on the amenities of this neighbouring property with regards to loss of light, outlook or visual amenities.
- 7.2.4 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on the properties at the rear of the site, on Selby Close. The site benefits from a large rear garden that is approximately 38m deep. Therefore the proposed two storey rear extension is not considered to result in a loss of privacy over and above what would normally be expected in a residential setting such as this.
- 7.2.5 Having regard to the scale, siting and separation distance of the development, it is not considered that a significant loss of amenity with particular regard to light, outlook, prospect and privacy would arise.

7.3 Highways – Acceptable

- 7.3.1 The proposal results in the loss of the garage, currently located within the rear garden. The proposal includes a replacement side garage, however it is only 2.3m wide and 4.15m deep. The proposed ground floor plan indicates space

for one car parking space in front of this garage utilising the existing crossover. An additional crossover is proposed to provide vehicular access to a second parking space within the frontage. The proposed ground floor plan indicates that the hardstanding will be constructed with permeable block paving. And the front wall and landscaping will be no higher than 0.6m. As such no objection is raised from a highways perspective.

7.4 Trees

7.4.1 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact on protected trees. The rear of the garden is subject to a blanket Tree Preservation Order (TPO), which protects any oak tree in the designated area. The TPO area is over 15m from the rear of the property and the proposed development will not go beyond the rear of the existing garage.

8 CONCLUSION

8.1 Having regard to the above, the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area or harm the amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted

Subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard time limit of 3 years
2. Standard compliance with approved plans
3. Matching materials
4. Car parking details to be implemented
5. Obscure glaze and fix shut first floor flank windows