

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 11/03134/FULL6

Ward:
Farnborough And Crofton

Address : 22 Grasmere Gardens Orpington BR6
8HE

OS Grid Ref: E: 543637 N: 165369

Applicant : Mr James Waite

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Two storey side extension

Proposal

- It is proposed to add a two storey side extension to the southern side of the dwelling, which would measure 3.8m in width
- The extension would be set back 2m from the side boundary at the front, increasing to 3.37m at the rear
- The pitched roof would match the roofline of the existing house.

Location

This two storey semi-detached property is located on a corner plot on the northern side of Grasmere Gardens at the junction with Grasmere Road and Grasmere Avenue. It currently maintains a separation to the southern flank boundary of between 5.8m and 7m.

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space

Planning History

Permission was refused in February 2011 (ref.10/03343) for a two storey side extension to this property on the following grounds:

The proposed extension would, by reason of its size, bulk and close proximity to the side boundary, result in a cramped form of development on this prominent corner site, detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the character of the surrounding area, thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The subsequent appeal was dismissed in March 2011 wherein the Inspector considered that the proposals would cause significant harm to the visual amenities of the street scene.

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are the impact of the revised proposals on the visual amenities of the street scene, and on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

The main difference between the current proposals and the scheme dismissed on appeal is that the rear part of the side extension which projected approximately 0.6m further to the side with a lower roofline has now been deleted, thereby increasing the side space provided towards the rear of the extension to a maximum 3.37m rather than 2.75m. However, the extension would still provide only a 2m separation to the side boundary at the front, and the majority of the extension would still fall within 3m of the side boundary.

In dismissing the previous appeal, the Inspector considered that the extension would project forward of the established building line of housing to the east, and in doing so, would result in a prominent form of development which would appear incongruous in the street scene. He also considered that due to the bulk of the proposed side extension, the proposals would unbalance the appearance of the design of the pair of houses which are in a prominent location. He concluded that the proposed development would appear out of place and prominent, and would cause significant harm to the visual amenities and character of the street scene.

The current proposals would provide a slightly greater separation to the side boundary, and would appear marginally less bulky, however, the extension would still project forward of the general building line to the east, and would still unbalance the pair of dwellings. It is considered that the extension would still appear bulky and over-prominent within the street scene, and would thus be detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.

With regard to the impact on residential amenity, the extensions are confined to the southern side of the dwelling, and would not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of nearby residents.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 10/03343 and 11/03134, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposed extension would, by reason of its size, bulk and close proximity to the side boundary, result in a cramped form of development on this prominent corner site and would unbalance this pair of dwellings, which would be detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene and the character of the surrounding area, thereby contrary to Policies H8, H9 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Application:11/03134/FULL6

Address: 22 Grasmere Gardens Orpington BR6 8HE

Proposal: Two storey side extension

