

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

**Application No :** 10/02618/FULL1

**Ward:**  
**Bromley Common And**  
**Keston**

**Address :** 361 Southborough Lane Bromley BR2  
8BQ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 543402 N: 167628

**Applicant :** GVS Developments

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

2 two storey four bedroom semi-detached houses with accommodation in roof space and 4 car parking spaces.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
Local Cycle Network  
Local Distributor Roads

**Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing bungalow at the site and the erection of a pair of semi-detached properties. The proposal is summarised as follows:

- 2 two storey semi-detached houses with accommodation within the roof space
- both houses propose four bedrooms
- the maximum height of the building is 8.55m
- height to eaves is 4.9m
- the maximum depth of the properties is 13.1m and width of 11.5m
- the entrance to the properties is to the side
- the rear gardens (when measured from the central point) are proposed at approximately 28m in depth
- vehicular access to the site will remain via the two existing crossovers via Southborough Lane
- 4 car parking spaces (2 for each property) are proposed

It is noted that the plans received on 8th November 2010 indicate that the garage previously proposed has now been removed from the scheme to allow satisfactory turning areas. The Agent also sent an additional drawing (dated 8th October 2010) which shows how the proposed building will look within the street scene.

## **Location**

The site currently comprises a detached bungalow to the northern side of Southborough Lane which is a Local Distributor Road. To the rear of the site lies Jubilee Country Park, however the application site does not have an open space designation within the Unitary Development Plan. The property has a public footpath into the park running along the western boundary between No.361 and No. 357. This part of Southborough Lane is residential and comprises mainly two storey semi-detached properties.

## **Comments from Local Residents**

There have been local objections raised in respect of the application which are summarised below:

- application should be refused
- not in accordance with UDP policies
- overshadow No. 363- loss of daylight and sunlight
- developer has already cut down trees to the side of No.363 and to the entrance to Jubilee Park
- 2 bed bungalow would normally be occupied by a couple- proposal could result in an additional 12 people
- noise and disturbance as a result of increased use and use of side entrance
- additional traffic
- impact on road safety
- proposed dwellings are of excessive scale, form and bulk
- incompatible with street scene
- roof lights at front show that proposal would be overdevelopment
- incongruous design
- out of keeping with character of area
- proposed height would be about 2m above No.363
- inaccuracies in drawings (amended by plans received 8th Oct)
- removal of trees
- cramped development
- close proximity to MOL and visible from the park
- small bungalow are at a premium in Bromley
- does not comply with H9 as proposal fails to provide a more generous side space

A full copy of the above letter can be viewed on file ref. 10/02618. Any further comments received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

## **Comments from Consultees**

- Highways- no objections are raised regarding the amended parking layout show on plans received 8th November 2010
- Thames Water do not raise objections with regard to the sewerage infrastructure of surface water drainage.
- The Council's Waste advisors state that refuse and recycling should be placed at the edge of curtilage on day of collection
- The Council's drainage planner does not raise objections provided that a soakage test is carried out prior to a soakaway being installed at the site.

## **Planning Considerations**

In considering the application the main policies are H7, H9, BE1, T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan. These concern the housing supply, density and design of new housing/new development, the provision of adequate car parking and new accesses and road safety.

Policy H7 aims to ensure that new residential development respects the existing built and natural environment, is of appropriate density and respects the spatial standards of the area as well as amenities adjacent occupiers, and allows adequate light penetration into and between buildings.

Policy BE1 requires a high standard of design in new development generally, and seeks to protect the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Policy T3 seeks to ensure that off street parking provisions for new development are to approved standards. Policy T18 requires that issues of road safety are considered in determining planning applications.

Government guidance in the form of PPS3 "Housing" generally encourages higher density developments in appropriate locations, while emphasising the role of good design and layout to achieve the objectives of making the best use of previously developed land and improving the quality and attractiveness of residential areas, but without compromising the quality of the environment.

In terms of tree on the site, it is considered that no significant trees would be affected by this proposal. It is suggested that a condition be placed on any permission to seek a replacement hedge along the boundary with the footpath. It is considered that none of the existing trees is of sufficient size or amenity value to warrant making a TPO.

## **Planning History**

There is no recent planning history at the site.

It is noted that the property at No.363 has been previously extended (ref. 99/01970) by way of a two storey side and single storey front extensions; front and rear dormers and extension to existing main roof; chimney stack and wall to west side. Planning permission was also granted under ref.04/03005 for a part one/two storey side/ rear extension and the conversion of the existing dwelling into 2 semi-

detached properties (however it is not evident that this permission was ever implemented).

## **Conclusions**

The main issues in this case are whether this type of development is acceptable in principle in this location, the likely impact of the proposed scheme on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, having particular regard to layout and design of the proposed dwellings.

In terms of form and scale, the height of the proposed dwellings would be comparable to the majority of the other semi-detached properties nearby. The proposed houses are shown to be approximately 0.2m higher than the adjacent property at No.357 and approximately by 1.7m higher than No.363. It is noted that the proposal would be higher than the adjacent neighbour at No.363 but given the mix of property types in the area it is not considered that the higher ridge height at the application site would look out of character within the street scene.

The proposed dwellings do maintain a minimum separation of 1.4m to the eastern boundary (adjacent to No.363) and minimum separation of 1.2m increasing to 4.5m to the western boundary (when scaled). This is greater than the normal 1m side space normally sought for residential proposals and Members may consider adequate to comply with the spatial standards of the area.

With regard to the impact of the proposed building on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties, the proposal retains reasonable distances between the adjoining properties and does not project excessively beyond the established front or rear building lines. Concerns have been received from the neighbour at No.363 and Members should give careful consideration to the impact of the proposed dwellings on this property and the amenities of surrounding neighbours.

There are 2 car parking spaces per dwelling proposed to the front and the existing vehicular accesses will be used. It is noted that no objections are raised from the Council's Highways engineer.

On balance, Members may consider that the proposal as submitted is acceptable in this location.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 10/02618 excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 08.10.2010 08.11.2010

## **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1      ACA01      Commencement of development within 3 yrs  
          ACA01R      A01 Reason 3 years

2	ACA04 ACA04R	Landscaping Scheme - full app no details Reason A04
3	ACC01 ACC01R	Satisfactory materials (ext'nl surfaces) Reason C01
4	ACH03 ACH03R	Satisfactory parking - full application Reason H03
5	ACH32 ADH32R	Highway Drainage Reason H32
6	ACI02	Rest of "pd" Rights - Class A, B,C and E
<b>Reason:</b> In order to prevent an overdevelopment at the site.		
7	ACI12 ACI12R	Obscure glazing (1 insert) in the first floor flank I12 reason (1 insert) BE1
8	ACI17 ACI17R	No additional windows (2 inserts) first floor flank dwellings I17 reason (1 insert) BE1

### **Reason for granting permission:**

In granting permission the Local Planning Authority had regard to the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

- H7 Housing Density and Design
- BE1 Design of New Development
- H9 Side Space
- T3 Parking
- T18 Road Safety

The development is considered to be satisfactory in relation to the following:

- (a) the appearance of the development in the street scene
- (b) the relationship of the development to the adjacent properties
- (c) the character of the development in the surrounding area
- (d) the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (e) the light and outlook of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (f) the privacy of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (g) the safety of pedestrians and motorists on the adjacent highway
- (h) the safety and security of building and the spaces around them
- (i) accessibility to the building
- (j) the housing policies of the development plan
- (k) the urban design policies of the development plan
- (l) the transport policies of the development plan
- (m) the neighbour concerns raised during the consultation process

and having regard to all other matters raised.

### **INFORMATIVE(S)**

- 1 RDI10 Consult Land Charges/Street Numbering
- 2 With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable

sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Reference: 10/02618/FULL1

Address: 361 Southborough Lane Bromley BR2 8BQ

Proposal: 2 two storey four bedroom semi-detached houses with accommodation in roof space and 4 car parking spaces.



This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Bromley. Lic. No: 100017661