# Section '3' - <u>Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or</u> CONSENT

Application No: 12/01645/FULL6 Ward:

**Cray Valley West** 

Address: 15 Spring Shaw Road Orpington BR5

2RH

OS Grid Ref: E: 546267 N: 169716

Applicant: Mr Steven Reeve Objections: YES

## **Description of Development:**

Single storey side and rear extensions

Key designations:

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

## **Proposal**

The proposal comprises two elements:

- single storey side extension situated behind of an existing detached garage and incorporating a pitched roof rising to maximum height of 4.45m. It will be set a minimum 1.0m off the western boundary
- single storey rear extension with pitched roof and rising to maximum height of 3.6m

#### Location

The application property is situated within the northern half of Spring Shaw Road which forms part of modern housing estate occupying the site of the former Walsingham School.

#### **Comments from Local Residents**

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

• specific concerns relating to side extension, rear extension is acceptable

- previous proposal to extend to the side has been refused and dismissed at appeal
- side extensions is effectively two storey development
- loss of outlook and harm to neighbouring amenities

### **Comments from Consultees**

Not applicable

# **Planning Considerations**

Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan apply to the development and should be given due consideration. These policies seek to ensure a satisfactory standard of design which complements the qualities of the surrounding area; and to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties.

# **Planning History**

Planning permission has previously been refused for development involving two storey side extensions under refs. 05/01548 and 09/03478. Under the latter reference a two storey extension was proposed which would have been situated within 1.0m of the western boundary. That was refused by the Council on the basis that it would result in an overdominant feature seriously prejudicial to the visual amenities and prospect of the adjacent properties. That opinion was subsequently endorsed by a Planning Inspector.

### **Conclusions**

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

Objections have been raised specifically in relation to the proposed single storey side extension on the basis of its perceived dominance from surrounding properties. In comparison to previous schemes its height has been reduced to one storey and given its siting and relationship relative to the adjoining property at No 13 it is not considered that the amenities of that property will be adversely affected. Furthermore, the lower part of the extension would largely be obscured. The roof also slopes away from the common boundary further reducing its prominence. Accordingly, no objection is raised in relation to this element.

With regard to its impact on local character both extensions would largely be screened from the frontage and surrounding streetscene. The side extension would be situated behind the existing detached garage. The extensions are considered proportionate in relation to the plot and surrounding estate. Accordingly it is considered that the character of the area will be maintained.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 05/01548, 09/03478 and 12/01645, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 10.08.2012

## **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
3	ACK01	Compliance with submitted plan
	ACC02R	Reason C02

# Reasons for permission:

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

BE1 Design of New DevelopmentH8 Residential Extensions

The development is considered satisfactory in relation to the following:

- (a) the appearance of the development in the street scene;
- (b) the relation 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

Application:12/01645/FULL6

Address: 15 Spring Shaw Road Orpington BR5 2RH

**Proposal:** Single storey side and rear extensions



© Crown copyright and database rights 2012. Ordnance Survey 100017661.