

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

**Application No :** 12/01921/FULL1

**Ward:**  
**Chelsfield And Pratts  
Bottom**

**Address :** 62 Windsor Drive Orpington BR6 6HD

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 546551 N: 163978

**Applicant :** Chelsfield Surgery

**Objections : NO**

**Description of Development:**

2 single storey modular buildings with attached walkway.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Local Distributor Roads

**Proposal**

- The proposal is for two cabins connected by a corridor to the rear of 62 Windsor Drive.
- The cabins are to provide additional health care facilities to the doctor's surgery at the property.
- The smaller cabin (labelled no.1) is located on the existing two storey rear projection and measures 2.6m deep, 2.9m wide and 3.9m high.
- The larger cabin (labelled no.2) is located adjacent to the boundary shared with no. 64 Windsor Drive and measures 9.9m deep, 3m wide and ...high. This is positioned 1.2m from the rear elevation of the building.
- The cabins are linked by a corridor which runs the full length - a total of 11 metres from the rear of the property.
- There are steps and a platform both immediately to the rear of the property and to the rear of the cabins

**Location**

- The application site is located to the north west of Windsor Drive and is on the corner Windsor Drive and Woodside.
- The site is a doctor's surgery and is surrounded by mainly residential properties.

## **Comments from Local Residents**

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

- The additional services which can be provided with the use of the extension will benefit not only existing patients but also relieve pressure on the Princess Royal Hospital.

## **Planning Considerations**

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

BE1 Design of New Development  
C4 Health Facilities  
T18 Road Safety

## **Planning History**

Planning permission was granted for single storey side and rear extensions in 1989 under ref. 89/03617.

Planning permission was granted for a single storey side extension in 1999 under ref. 99/03577.

Planning permission was granted for a single storey rear extension for a consultation room in 2009 under ref. 09/02823.

Planning permission has been refused under ref. 11/02841 for the retention of a cabins and connecting corridor to the rear to provide additional facilities.

The reasons for refusal were:

1. By reason of its excessive depth and close proximity to residential properties, the development results in a severe impact on the privacy and outlook of neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. By reason of its overall size and visibility from the public realm, the development is out of character with the residential character of the area and is detrimental to the amenities of surrounding residential properties and the streetscene in general, contrary to Policies BE1 and C4 of the Unitary Development Plan.
3. The concrete-surfacing laid out to provide car parking as part of the works to provide the modular buildings is unacceptable by reason of its visual impact and lack of information regarding disposal of surface water, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

## Conclusions

The main issues relating to this proposal are the impact of the development on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties given the proposed extension of the premises outside town centre, district centre, local centre or local neighbourhood centre, and the impact on traffic and road safety in and around the surrounding area and whether the revised proposals address the reasons for refusal.

In terms of background, a previous planning application was granted for a single storey extension (ref. 09/02823) which remains extant until 22/01/2013. This was relatively modest and had an acceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties. The current application seeks to address the refusal of ref. 11/02841 which refused permission for two cabins with covered walkway.

The current application proposes to relocate the smaller cabin and reduce the covered walkway and reduce the height of the platform on which the large cabin is situated.

The large cabin has now been reduced from a maximum height of 3.5m to 2.7m. The flank windows however, would remain visible from the neighbouring rear garden of no. 64 Windsor Drive.

The second, smaller cabin would be relocated from the rear of the large cabin to the rear elevation of the original building, now partially obscuring a window. The total rear projection has as such been reduced from a total of 14.4m to 11m. The width of the development however, has increased from 4.8m to 7.5m.

Although the depth and height has been reduced, it would remain considerable and continue to appear ungainly when viewed as part of the rear garden environment, by reason of the alien materials and continue to be of an intrusive nature on the occupiers of No. 64 Windsor Gardens.

The cabins remain visible from the highway, and with the relocation of the smaller cabin is now located closer to the highway than before. This would appear dominant, obscuring architectural features on the existing property. The cabins and walkway are the same as previously refused and remain unattractive in design which appears completely incongruous in their residential setting.

Members may consider that the cabins, due to their depth close to the boundary, height and flank windows would have a harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, particularly No. 64 Windsor Drive and No. 1 Woodside. The larger cabin would continue to be located on the boundary and appear obtrusive and dominant when viewed from the rear garden scene of no. 64 Windsor Drive.

The development utilises the refused structures, which are unattractive and have a commercial appearance, contrary to the buildings residential setting. The relocation of the smaller cabin now means that it is located closer to the highway than previously proposed and would appear highly prominent. Together with the larger

cabin and covered corridor the development as a whole would be highly visible from surrounding public view points, and be harmful in the streetscene.

The large areas of concrete laid to the rear of the site remains in situ. The Design and Access statement states that an improved parking area will be provided. It does not provide detail as to the improvements; neither do the plans suggest any alteration from the unacceptable layout and material. This would continue to be detrimental with regard to surface water drainage.

As a whole the development does not address the reasons for refusal and whilst it is appreciated that the development may create an improved surgery for local residents, the harmful impact on the amenities of local residents, road safety and the character of the residential area are considered to outweigh the benefits of this proposal and Members may be minded to refuse planning permission for this development for these reasons.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 89/03617, 99/03577, 09/02823 and 11/02841, excluding exempt information.

#### RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 By reason of its excessive depth and close proximity to residential properties, the development results in a severe impact on the privacy and outlook of neighbouring properties, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 2 By reason of its overall size and visibility from the public realm, the development is out of character with the residential character of the area and is detrimental to the amenities of surrounding residential properties and the streetscene in general, contrary to Policies BE1 and C4 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 3 The concrete-surfacing laid out to provide car parking as part of the works to provide the modular buildings is unacceptable by reason of its visual impact and lack of information regarding disposal of surface water, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 5.13 of the London Plan.

Further recommendation: Enforcement action to be authorised to seek removal of the development.

**Application:**12/01921/FULL1

**Address:** 62 Windsor Drive Orpington BR6 6HD

**Proposal:** 2 single storey modular buildings with attached walkway.

