

Committee Date	28 th October 2021	
Address	The Croft Yester Park Chislehurst BR7 5DQ	
Application Number	21/03668/FULL6	Officer - Lawrence Stannard
Ward	Chislehurst	
Proposal	Two storey side/rear extensions with single storey rear extension and loft conversion (renewal of permission 18/04093/FULL6 allowed on appeal on 01 March 2019)	
Applicant	Agent	
Mr & Mrs N Carpenter	Mr Peter Hadley	
The Croft, Yester Park Chislehurst BR7 5DQ	Robinson Escott Planning Downe House 303 High Street Orpington BR6 0NN United Kingdom	
Reason for referral to committee	Councillor call in	
Side Space	No	

RECOMMENDATION	Permission
-----------------------	------------

<p>KEY DESIGNATIONS</p> <p>Chislehurst Conservation Area Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area London City Airport Safeguarding Smoke Control SCA 16</p>

Representation summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbour notification letters were sent on the 1st September 2021. • A site notice was displayed on the 12th September 2021. • A Press Advert was published on the 1st September 2021.
Total number of responses	0
Number in support	0
Number of objections	0

1 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The development would not result in a harmful impact on the character of the Conservation Area.
- The development would not result in a harmful impact on the appearance of the host dwelling.
- The development would not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties

2 LOCATION

- 2.1 The site is located on the northern side of Yester Park within Chislehurst Conservation Area and hosts a detached two storey dwelling set within a generous plot size.
- 2.2 The site lies within the Chislehurst Conservation Area and the wider area is characterised by other similar residential properties.



Figure 1: Site Location Plan

3 PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application seeks permission for two storey side/rear extensions with single storey rear extension and loft conversion. The application is a renewal of permission 18/04093/FULL6 which was allowed on appeal on 1st March 2019.
- 3.2 It is proposed to add a first floor side extension to its western side over the existing garage, and extend to the rear with a part two storey extension (measuring 2.45m deep, which is similar to the existing single storey rear extension with balcony over which would be removed), and single

storey rear extension (measuring a further 5.3m deep), giving an overall depth from the original rear wall of 7.75m.

- 3.3 Second floor accommodation is also proposed within the extended roof and includes side roof lights and 2 rear dormers.



Figure 2: Existing and Proposed Elevations

4 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 The relevant planning history relating to the application site is summarised as follows ;

- 10/00150/FULL6 - First floor side and one/two storey side and rear extensions. Rear dormer extension - Permitted
- 10/01735/FULL6 - First floor side and one/two storey side and rear extensions. Rear dormer extension. (Amendment to permission ref: 10/00150 to increase depth of single storey rear extension) – Allowed on Appeal
- 18/04093/FULL6 - Two storey side/rear extensions with single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormers. – Allowed on Appeal.

5 CONSULTATION SUMMARY

A) Statutory

No Statutory Consultations were received.

B) Local Groups

No Comments were received from local groups.

C) Adjoining Occupiers

No comments were received from adjoining occupiers.

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 London Plan (March 2021) and the Bromley Local Plan (2019). 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 National Policy Framework 2019

6.6 The London Plan

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

6.7 Bromley Local Plan 2019

- 6 Residential Extensions
- 8 Side Space
- 37 General Design of Development
- 41 Conservation Areas
- 123 Sustainable Design and Construction

6.8 Bromley Supplementary Guidance

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

7 ASSESSMENT

7.1 Resubmission

7.1.1 Following the allowing of appeal ref. 10/01735/FULL6 and ref: 18/04093/FULL6 the current application is identical to that previously allowed and is resubmitted as a result of the expiration of the appeal decision / to extend the time period for the implementation of the development.

7.2 Design, Layout, Scale and Heritage Impact – Acceptable

- 7.2.1 The proposed extension will include a two storey side extension that would be constructed within 1m of the flank boundary of the site at ground floor level.
- 7.2.2 Policy 8 of the Bromley Local Plan requires a minimum 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site for proposals of two or more storeys in height to be retained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the building. This policy seeks to ensure "that the retention of space around residential buildings is essential to ensure adequate separation and to safeguard the privacy and amenity of adjoining residents. It is important to prevent a cramped appearance and unrelated terracing from occurring. It is also necessary to protect the high spatial standards and level of visual amenity which characterise many of the Borough's residential areas."
- 7.2.3 It is noted that, the presence of the term 'normally' in the body of policy 8 implies a need for discretion in the application of the policy, having regard to several factors including the characteristics of the site and its surroundings, the precise nature of the proposal and the objectives of the policy as set out in the explanatory text.
- 7.2.4 As the site falls within the Chislehurst Conservation Area there is a presumption to preserve and enhance the special character and features of the area.
- 7.2.5 It is noted that Yester Park is characterised by large detached dwellings within large plots, many of which provide a variety of side space to the flank boundaries. It is considered important to preserve the areas of side space which do exist in order to retain the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 7.2.6 This design matches the design allowed under appeal under ref. 10/01735/FULL6 and more recently under ref: 18/04093/FULL6.
- 7.2.7 When considering the most recent appeal, the Inspector states:
- “Due to the height, scale and design of the proposal within a plot of significant size, I do not consider that the cumulative extensions proposed, including those to the rear and the loft conversion, would cause an over development of the appeal site. The spacious setting of the appeal dwelling within the plot and within the wider street scene would be retained.”
- 7.2.8 The proposed development seeks permission for extensions of the same design and scale, as those previously allowed on appeal and there are no significant changes of circumstances at the site or surroundings that would lead the Council to consider the application differently to the Inspector. The current development would therefore not result in any additional impact above that which has previously been approved and the Council's Conservation Officer has confirmed no objection from a heritage point of view as the proposal is the same as the previous scheme.
- 7.2.9 Having regard to the form, scale, siting and proposed materials it is considered that the proposed extensions would complement the host property and would not appear out of character with surrounding development or the area generally. It is therefore considered that the character of the Conservation Area would be preserved.

7.3 Residential Amenity – Acceptable

7.3.1 The adjacent dwelling to the east, known as Hatton Orchard, has been extended to the rear at ground floor level, but the current scheme would project significantly further to the rear. This relationship was considered acceptable under ref. 10/01735 and 18/04093/FULL6 when the Inspector allowed the previous appeal.

7.3.2 Within the original appeal (ref: 10/01735/FULL6) The Inspector stated:

'I accept that the single storey element of the extension would be both wide and deep but that would not, in itself, make it harmful. The boundaries on both sides of the rear garden have very substantial planting which would screen the extension. Moreover, the extension would be built at the level of the existing patio which is cut slightly into the rising ground to the rear and the floor level would thus be below the neighbouring gardens which would reduce the visual impact of the building. The extension would be set in slightly from the boundary with Hatton Orchard which is itself set in from the boundary apart from the integral garage. The extension would be significantly deeper than the single storey extension at Hatton Orchard but, in my judgement, it would not be overbearing or intrusive in the outlook from Hatton Mount because of its low profile and the effective boundary screening.'

7.3.3 In light of the identical nature of the proposed development and the similar circumstances of the site and surroundings, the proposal would not be considered to impact harmfully on the amenities of Hatton Mount to a degree that would warrant refusal of the application.

7.3.4 There would be sufficient separation between the extensions and the adjoining property to the west (Wychling) to ensure that their amenities would not be unduly affected. This relationship was also considered acceptable previously.

7.3.5 Having regard to the above, it is not considered that a significant loss of amenity with particular regard to light, outlook, prospect and privacy would arise.

8 CONCLUSION

8.1 Having had regard to the above it is 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 nor impact detrimentally on the character of the Conservation Area.

8.2 Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the files set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

Recommendation: Permission

Conditions

1. Time Period
2. Matching Materials
3. Compliance with approved plans