

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

**Application No :** 12/01767/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Farnborough And Crofton**

**Address :** 22 Grasmere Gardens Orpington BR6  
8HE

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 543637 N: 165369

**Applicant :** Mr James

**Objections : NO**

**Description of Development:**

Part one/two storey side/rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
Flood Zone 2  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Ravensbourne FZ2

**Proposal**

It is proposed to add a part one/two storey side/rear extension which would measure 2.75m in width at the front of the property, increasing to 4.1m towards the rear, and would project 3m to the rear. The extension would be set back a minimum 3m from the southern flank boundary.

**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 and the London 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 wider 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.

Permission was then refused in December 2011 (ref.11/03134) for a revised two storey side extension which slightly reduced the width of the extension towards the rear, 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 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.”

The subsequent appeal was dismissed in May 2012 wherein the Inspector considered that the revised scheme would still cause significant harm to the visual amenities of the street scene and to the character and appearance of the pair of dwellings.

Meanwhile, permission ref.12/00349 was granted for a single storey side/rear extension which projected 3m to the rear across the width of the house, and provided a separation of between 1-2.85m to the southern boundary of the plot.

## **Conclusions**

The main issues in this case are the effect that the proposals would have on the appearance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings, on the character and spatial standards of the surrounding area and on the amenities of nearby residents.

In dismissing the latest appeal, the Inspector was concerned that the gap to the side of the property would be considerably reduced, and that “the proposed additional width as well as roof detailing, reducing the depth of the half hip on one end and the additional windows, would substantially unbalance the appearance of the pair of dwellings”.

The revised proposals now provide a greater separation to the southern flank boundary of this corner plot of at least 3m for the full depth of the extension, however, the number of windows and roof detailing (including the reduction in depth of the half hip to one end) remain the same. Additionally a further part one/two storey rear extension has been added, and Members will need to carefully consider whether the applicant has adequately addressed the concerns of the Inspector in the previous appeal.

With regard to the impact on residential amenity, the part one/two storey rear extension would project 3m to the rear, while the first floor element would be set back approx. 2.9m from the northern flank boundary with No.21. The adjoining property has a similar depth single storey extension immediately adjacent to the proposals, and a high party wall along the boundary, thereby limiting the effect of the proposals on the adjoining property. The proposals are not therefore considered to result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 10/03343, 11/03134, 12/00349 and 12/01767, excluding exempt information.

#### **RECOMMENDATION: MEMBERS' VIEWS ARE REQUESTED**

- |   |        |  |                |                            |
|---|--------|--|----------------|----------------------------|
| 0 | D00002 | If Members are minded to grant planning permission the following conditions are suggested: |                |                            |
| 1 | ACA01  | Commencement of development within 3 yrs   |                |                            |
|   | ACA01R | A01 Reason 3 years   |                |                            |
| 2 | ACC07  | Materials as set out in application  |                |                            |
|   | ACC07R | Reason C07   |                |                            |
| 3 | ACI10  | Side space (1 insert)  | 3m             | southern                   |
|   | ACI10R | Reason I10   |                |                            |
| 4 | ACI13  | No windows (2 inserts)   | northern flank | first floor rear extension |

**Reason:** In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

#### **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
- H9 Side Space

The development is considered to be satisfactory in relation to the following:

- (a) the visual impact in the street scene
- (b) the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of nearby residential properties,

and having regard to all other matters raised, including neighbours concerns.

INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1 Before work commences on the extension hereby permitted you should satisfy yourself that the minimum side space to the boundary shown on the submitted drawing can be achieved. Failure to comply with the Council's requirements set out in the conditions above may result in enforcement action being authorised.

D00003 If Members are minded to refuse planning permission the following grounds are suggested:

- 1 The proposed extension would, by reason of its size, bulk, design and close proximity to the southern 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:**12/01767/FULL6

**Address:** 22 Grasmere Gardens Orpington BR6 8HE

**Proposal:** Part one/two storey side/rear extension

