Application No: 10/00337/FULL6 Ward:

Farnborough And Crofton

Address: 22 Monks Way Orpington BR5 1HN

OS Grid Ref: E: 544486 N: 166267

Applicant: Mr And Mrs Hudson Objections: YES

## **Description of Development:**

Single storey front extension, side and rear dormer extensions

Key designations:

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

# **Proposal**

- Two metre front extension
- Insertion of four dormer windows (two on either flank elevation to be obscure glazed and fixed shut)
- Three skylights (located on either flank elevation towards the front of the property)
- One rear dormer window

This application follows an appeal which was dismissed on the 24th November 2009. Two previous applications were refused on the 6th May 2009 (application ref. 09/00653) and 13th November 2008 (application ref. 08/03056).

### Location

The application site is a detached bungalow which lies on the north side of Monks Way, Petts Wood, Kent.

### **Comments from Local Residents**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and three letters of representation were received which can be summarised as follows:

- overlooking
- loss of privacy
- extension will not be in-keeping with other properties in the road
- loss of daylight and sunlight

- no material alterations since the previous application
- the proposal would result in a bulky development
- out of character with other properties in the area
- overshadowing

#### **Comments from Consultees**

#### **Thames Water**

There are public sewers crossing the site and no building works will be permitted within 3 metres of the sewers without Thames Water's approval. Should a building/diversion application form or other information relating to Thames Waters assets be required the applicant should be advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services.

# Drainage

The proposed works appear to be very close to or over existing public sewer(s); the applicant should be advised to consult TWU as soon as possible to ascertain the exact sewer locations and to establish what protection measures may be required.

# **Planning Considerations**

The London Borough of Bromley Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2006)

BE1 Design of New Development

H8 Residential Extensions

# **Planning History**

An appeal was dismissed on the 24th November 2009. The Inspector cited that that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of Nos. 20 and 24 Monks Way through actual and perceived overlooking and loss of sunlight.

Under planning application ref. 09/00653, planning permission was refused on the 6th May 2009 for a two storey front and rear roof extensions and 6 side dormers. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

The proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site by reason of the amount of site coverage and the bulk of the proposed extensions which would be detrimental and out of character with the surrounding area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed roof extensions would give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of light, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Under planning application ref. 08/03056, planning permission was refused on the 13th November 2008 for a two storey front extension and 6 side dormers. The reasons for refusal were as follows:

The proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site by reason of the amount of site coverage and the proposed extensions would be detrimental and out of character with the surrounding area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed roof extensions would give rise to an unacceptable degree of overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of light, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

### **Conclusions**

Further to the Inspectors decision to dismiss the appeal in November 2009 the main issue to assess when considering this revised application is the impact of the development on the occupants of No. 20 and No.24 Monks Way.

The applicant has reduced the projection of the front extension from 3m to 2m, reduced the bulk of the dormers window on either flank elevation, substituted two of the dormer windows for skylights, omitted the proposed roof extension to the rear, made the dormer windows obscured glazed and two fixed shut and put a dormer window at the rear.

No. 22 Monks Way was built behind the established building line of other properties located in the immediate vicinity along Monks Way because a public sewer crosses the front garden of No. 22. Despite the changes made by the applicant No. 20 Monks Way will lose a degree of light if the proposed front extension is built. No. 24 Monks Way will also be affected by the proposed development as Nos.22 and 24 are built close together. No.24 already suffers from a loss of light to their kitchen which is dark especially during winter months. If the development was built the kitchen would be made considerably darker and the development would block out daylight and sunlight to No. 24's bathroom, staircase and hallway. The whole of the eastern flank of No. 24 will be significantly affected.

The front extension would also leave very little gap between Nos. 22 and 24. Taking into account the 2m extension, plus the overhang and guttering there would be 0.85m gap between the roof guttering. It is noted that issues of privacy and overlooking have been overcome by the insertion of skylight and four dormer windows on either flank elevation being obscured glazed and two fixed shut.

Despite the alterations made since the 2008 and 2009 applications the front extension will still cause a loss of daylight and sunlight to the occupiers of Nos. 20 and 24 which is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties. The occupiers will still experience a certain degree of overshadowing and loss of light as a result of the front extension.

Other properties along Monks Way have had dormer extensions in similar elevations but not to the extent that the applicant is proposing. It is considered that the Inspector's concern for dismissing the appeal has not been overcome and planning permission should be refused.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. AP/09/00118, 10/00337, 09/00653 and 08/03056, excluding exempt information.

### RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

The proposed front extension together with the insertion of four dormer windows will cause and unacceptable loss of light and loss of prospect to No. 24 Monks Way contrary to Polices BE1 and H8 of the Bromley Unitary Development Plan.

Reference: 10/00337/FULL6

Address:



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