

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

**Application No :** 13/04170/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Cray Valley West**

**Address :** 175 Oakdene Road Orpington BR5 2AP

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 546003 N: 167481

**Applicant :** Mr George Belchamber

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, front porch and elevational alterations

Key designations:

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

**Proposal**

- 3.4m wide (approx.) two storey side extension
- The first floor extension would project approximately 3.3m beyond the rear building line of the main dwelling
- 3.3m deep single storey rear extension
- Front porch
- The extensions would provide 1 additional bedroom, en-suite bathroom and separate bathroom at first floor
- At ground floor an extended sitting room, dining room and kitchen would be provided as well as a larder and utility room
- The existing outside store rooms and WC would be demolished as part of the proposal.

**Location**

- The application site comprises of a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse.
- The surrounding area is residential in character.

**Comments from Local Residents**

- notice not displayed prominently enough
- extension is too large, obtrusive and unwarranted
- two additional front windows would lead to a loss of privacy to No.92 Oakdene Rd
- loss of views
- significant loss of light to No.92 Oakdene Rd
- render would look out of keeping with neighbouring properties
- flood risk from surface water
- increase in car parking in road
- damage to wildlife
- closer proximity of double storey extension would be overbearing and result in a loss of privacy
- two storeys extend beyond houses current depth
- 4 side windows would overlook next door
- major loss of direct sunlight and ambient daylight
- damage to drains
- demolition of sheds would cause damage to neighbouring sheds
- reduction in greenery
- plans incorrect
- more than 1m side space required in areas where there is greater spatial quality
- side extensions should not be visually dominating
- two storey rear extension should be 2m from party wall
- window placement is unbalanced
- should be similar in appearance to existing house
- detrimental to health
- would almost double width of house.

### **Comments from Consultees**

Drainage were consulted on the application. Their comments will be reported verbally at the meeting.

### **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**

No planning history at application site.

The adjoining semi-detached property (No. 173) was granted planning permission for a two storey side extension under ref. 04/04629.

## 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.

In terms of scale and design, the proposed side extension would be equal in height to the main roof ridge and would incorporate a full hipped roof to match that of the existing building. The width of the existing building scales off at around 7.6m and the extension approximately 3.5m. The two storey side extension would therefore be less than half the width of the original dwelling and would maintain a 1m side space to the flank boundary of the site for the full height and length of the extension, which is considered compliant with the requirements of Policy H9. Furthermore, substantial separation would be retained between Nos. 175 and 177 so as not to appear cramped.

Neighbours have raised concerns over the size of the extension and its impact on the street scene as well as views between the houses. While Nos.175 and 177 do have generous side spaces, as do Nos.183 and 185 which are separated by an alley way, overall, the road is not characterised by such large gaps in between buildings. Indeed, the adjoining semi-detached property, No.173, has had a two storey side extension permitted under ref. 04/04629 and constructed, although this is not depicted on the site plan. As such the resulting development would not unbalance this pair of semi-detached properties, nor would it have a significant impact on the spatial standards or visual amenities of the area.

To the rear the extension would project approximately 3.3m beyond the existing building line, which is not considered excessive for a semi-detached house of this scale. The two storey rear element would be set below the level of the main ridge height (by approximately 1m), helping the extension to appear more subservient to the host building. At ground floor level a separation of just under 1m will be retained to the flank boundary with 173 and at first floor, the extension would be sited approximately 7.3m from the party boundary. The impact on the amenities of the occupiers of 173 is therefore likely to be insignificant and, overall, the scale and form of the development is considered in keeping with the host building. A condition requiring details of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development is recommended to ensure they are appropriate to the area.

With regard to the impact on the occupiers of No.177, to the west of the site, concerns have been raised about overlooking from the 4 windows proposed in the first floor flank elevation, loss of sunlight and daylight and an overbearing impact from the extension. Two of the windows in the side elevation would serve bathrooms and the remaining two would be secondary bedroom windows. A condition requiring that all 4 windows are obscure glazed and non-opening above a certain height is therefore considered expedient to protect neighbouring occupiers privacy.

The properties in this part of the road have a south-facing rearward orientation and while some overshadowing of No.177 would result from the extension in the earlier part of the day and some lighting to the flank windows is likely to be affected,

overall, it is not considered that it would lead to a significant loss of daylight or sunlight to the adjacent property, particularly given the 5m separation which would be retained between the two buildings. This separation would also ensure that views from the rear windows at No.177 would not be unduly harmed.

In terms of the effects on the shared party wall as a result of demolishing the outdoor store and WC, this would be a private legal matter and not within the remit of the planning system. The Council's Drainage consultants have been notified of the application in terms of the potential impacts on surface water drainage and their comments will be reported at the meeting.

Given that the application site is a single dwellinghouse and the extension would provide only 1 additional bedroom, no significant impacts on the local road network are anticipated.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the files refs.04/04629 and 13/04170, set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 10.02.2014

## **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1      ACA01      Commencement of development within 3 yrs  
ACA01R      A01 Reason 3 years
- 2      ACC01      Satisfactory materials (ext'nl surfaces)  
ACC01R      Reason C01
- 3      ACI09      Side space (1 metre) (1 insert)      western  
ACI09R      Reason I09
- 4      ACI11      Obscure glaz'g/details of opening (1 in)      in the first floor  
western elevation  
ACI11R      Reason I11 (1 insert)      BE1
- 5      ACI13      No windows (2 inserts)      eastern extension  
ACI13R      I13 reason (1 insert)      BE1
- 6      ACK01      Compliance with submitted plan

**Reason:** In order to comply with Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual and residential amenities of the area.

**Application:**13/04170/FULL6

**Address:** 175 Oakdene Road Orpington BR5 2AP

**Proposal:** Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, front porch and elevational alterations



"This plan is provided to identify the location of the site and should not be used to identify the extent of the application site"

© Crown copyright and database rights 2013. Ordnance Survey 100017661.