

SECTION '3' – Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT

Application No : 10/03308/FULL6

**Ward:
Mottingham And Chislehurst
North**

**Address : 10 Smarden Grove Mottingham London
SE9 4LS**

OS Grid Ref: E: 542698 N: 171917

Applicant : Mr M Vijayapalan

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey side extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side extension to the host dwelling. The details of the proposal are as follows:

- width of approx. 4.5m
- depth of approx. 6.5m
- maximum height of 4.2m with pitched roof

Location

The application property is located on the western side of Smarden Grove, Mottingham, and comprises an end-of-terrace dwelling.

Comments from Local Residents

Owners/occupiers of nearby residential properties were notified of the application, and comments were received which can be summarised as follows:

- proposed extension will unbalance terrace, appearing unsightly and affect the symmetrical layout of Smarden Grove making it cramped and overdeveloped
- possible increase in parking demand – local area is at saturation point
- extension the same as that previously refused but for the fact that it comprises the ground floor only
- concerns regarding construction process and local disturbance

Comments from Consultees

No consultations were made in respect of this application.

Planning Considerations

The main policies against which this application will need to be assessed are as follows:

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions

Planning History

There is extensive planning history at the site.

Under ref. 05/03007, planning permission was refused for the erection of a two storey 2 bedroom end of terrace dwelling. A further application for a similar proposal was refused under ref. 05/04346, with an appeal against this decision also being dismissed.

At appeal, the Inspector found that the proposed development would appear cramped on the site and have an overbearing impact when viewed from the side garden of No. 78 Prestbury Square. Further concerns were raised regarding the reduction in space between the terraces and the effect of making the site too “built up”. Furthermore, the Inspector concluded that the development would be likely generate further demand for on street parking which would be prejudicial to road safety.

Recently, planning permission was refused for a two storey side extension under ref. 10/02182, for the following reason:

The proposed extension would represent a cramped overdevelopment of the site, eroding the open nature of this prominent corner plot to the detriment of the visual amenities of the street scene and the character of the area, and would in view of the proximity of the extension to the side/rear boundary result in an overbearing impact to the adjacent property at No. 78 Prestbury Square, detrimental to the amenities that the occupiers of this property could reasonably expect to continue to enjoy, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.’

Most recently, a certificate of lawfulness was granted for roof alterations incorporating a rear dormer extension under ref. 10/03472.

Conclusions

The main issue for consideration in this case will be the impact of the proposed extension to the character and appearance of the area and the amenities of neighbouring residents, with particular regard to the planning history at the site and whether the single storey extension now proposed would address the concerns previously raised. Although local residents are concerned that the extension would impact on parking demand in the area, no additional residential units are proposed on the site and accordingly the parking requirements for the property would not increase as a result of this proposal.

Planning permission was recently refused under ref. 10/02182 for a two storey side extension to the host property, of a similar depth but lesser width (3.5m) to that currently under consideration. That proposal was considered to be of concern in that the extension would be sited in close proximity to the side/rear boundary and in view of the relationship between the host property and the adjacent property at No. 78 Prestbury Square, would be likely to result in an overbearing impact to this property and its side/rear garden area. Furthermore, it was considered that the extension would in view of its siting, have been likely to erode the open nature of the side garden area resulting in harm to the visual amenities of the street scene and the character of the area.

The proposal now under consideration is of single storey construction, and as such would be likely to have a reduced impact to the amenities of the occupiers of No. 78 Prestbury Square in view of the reduced height, no longer appearing overbearing to this property. While the extension would clearly result in a reduction in the open space to the side of the site, again the harm previously identified to the character of the area would no longer appear so severe in view of the single storey construction of the extension, with openness and visual separation now retained at first floor level. While it is noted that the width of the extension is greater than that previously refused, this is not considered to be problematical in view of the single storey construction of the extension.

Having regard to the above, Members may agree that the proposal has addressed the concerns raised previously and that the extension is therefore acceptable on balance.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 10/03472, 10/02182, 05/04346, and 05/03007, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

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

2 ACC04 Matching materials
ACC04R Reason C04

Reasons for granting permission:

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

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions

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 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 conservation policies of the Unitary Development Plan

and having regard to all other matters raised.

Reference: 10/03308/FULL6
Address: 10 Smarden Grove Mottingham London SE9 4LS
Proposal: Single storey side extension



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