

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

Application No : 14/00188/FULL6

Ward:
Farnborough And Crofton

Address : 1 Brickfield Farm Gardens Orpington
BR6 7TE

OS Grid Ref: E: 544078 N: 164545

Applicant : Mrs Kate Waters

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Two storey side extension

Key designations:

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

Proposal

Members may recall that the application was previously withdrawn from the Plans Sub Committee agenda on 3rd April 2014 by the Chief Planner in order to seek clarification of the plans and the dimensions of the site.

Amended plans have now been received, which has resulted in an increase in width of the proposed side extension and consequently a reduction in separation between the flank elevation of the proposed extension and the property boundary. Neighbours have been re-notified, and the report has been amended accordingly.

- The proposal seeks permission for a two storey side extension.
- The proposed extension will measure 2.35m, 8.46m in depth to match the depth of the host dwelling, and the eaves and ridge will also match the eaves and ridge of the host dwelling.
- A separation of 0.3m would be retained between the property boundary and the flank elevation of the extension at the front, and a separation of 0.4m would be retained between the flank elevation and the property boundary towards the front of the extension.

Location

The application site is located on the corner of Brickfield Farm Gardens and State Farm Avenue, and hosts a two storey end of terrace property.

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the revised plans and no representations were received.

Comments from Consultees

No internal consultations were considered necessary.

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

There is no specific planning history related to the host dwelling itself other than the original planning approval for the construction of the property in 1983. Permission was granted under ref. 83/01124 for the erection of 47 one and two bedroom terraced houses.

Permission development rights were removed for all of the properties that were granted permission under this original planning approval.

Conclusions

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

The application site is located on the corner of Brickfield Farm Gardens and State Farm Avenue. Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan states in effect that for proposals of two or more storeys, a minimum separation of 1 metre is required between the property boundary and the flank elevation, for the full height and length of the flank elevation. Where higher standards of separation exist, such as corner properties, a greater separation may be required.

The revised plans and written information provided by the applicant, received 10th April 2014, state that the total width of the plot is 6.241 metres, and the total width of the proposed extension is 2.35 metres. The property boundary is the back edge of the pavement, excluding any part of the tarmac, therefore at the front of the proposed extension there will be a gap between the flank elevation of the extension and the property boundary of 30mm, and a gap of 40mm to the rear, this difference is due to the property boundary being on an angle.

Members will note this separation of between 30mm and 40mm is contrary to Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan for any form of two storey development, notwithstanding that the site is a corner location and therefore this type of proposal would generally require a greater separation than the usual 1 metre.

The applicant and agent have provided details of properties in the locality that appear to have either been built up to the property boundary, or extended to within a metre of the property boundary. The examples provided can be seen on the file, with photographs that have been submitted by the applicant to illustrate the developments. Looking at the property history of the examples given, the majority of the properties referred to by the applicant appear to have been either built close to the boundary originally as there is no planning history at the sites, they are historic cases, or they have been approved at Appeal.

The most recent application for a two storey side extension was at 73 Crofton Lane, originally refused by the Council under ref. 03/02701 but subsequently allowed at Appeal.

Whilst an extension approved at 1 Fieldside Close in 2002 (ref. 01/03725) did involve a first floor side extension, it would appear that due to the angle of the property boundary and the relationship with the adjacent dwelling, a separation does still exist between the flank elevation and the property boundary.

As such Members may consider that whilst the character of the example development are similar to that being proposed, direct comparison cannot be drawn between the current application and the examples provided.

Planning policy has not been significantly altered in recent years and in fact Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan has been strengthened with regard to the requirement for at least 1 metre separation from the property boundary for two or more storey development. The estate which the application site is located on is an open-plan estate. Policy H9, and in particular the need for greater separation on corner properties, is considered important to protect the character and the spatial standards of an area, especially with sites such as this where the estate features many open plan corner locations characterised by green or gravel verges.

Members may therefore consider that the proposed two storey side extension will have a detrimental effect on the spatial standards of the open-plan estate, and would not provide a suitable side space to the flank boundary of the site which would result in a cramped appearance on the plot within the street scene. Whilst it is appreciated that the proposed extension would not lead to unrelated terracing or a cramped appearance in relation to adjacent properties, as the site is a corner location and there is no property located directly to the west of the application site, the spirit of Policy H9 is also enforced in order to protect the high spatial standards and level of visual amenity which characterise residential areas, with this particular housing estate being a fine example of an area of open character and high spatial standards.

In terms of the scale and design of the proposed extension, extensions should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with

development in the surrounding area, and space or gaps should be respected where these contribute to the character of the area. Members may therefore consider that the lack of any form of separation between the proposed extension and the property boundary, notwithstanding a minimal gap of 30-40mm, does not respect the existing relationship that the host dwelling has with the plot it is located on, and as a result the scale of the proposed extension may be considered excessive on this corner location.

In conclusion, Members may consider that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would result in a significantly detrimental impact on the character of the area, a reduction in spatial standards and overdevelopment of the site, constituting an over dominant addition the host dwelling which lacks subservience, and does not comply with Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref. 14/00188 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 14.02.2014 10.04.2014

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

- 1 The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirements for a suitable side space to be maintained to the flank boundary in respect to two storey development on corner sites, in the absence of which the proposal would constitute a cramped development, out of character with the street scene in general and contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 2 The proposed extension, by reason of the overall width and bulk would constitute an over dominant addition to the main dwelling which would seriously reduce the spatial standards in this locality and would result in an unsatisfactory departure from the existing open visual qualities of the estate layout, thereby detrimental to the visual amenities of the area generally, and contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 3 If permitted the development would be likely to set a pattern for similar undesirable development in the road, to the detriment of the openness of the area and contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Application:14/00188/FULL6

Address: 1 Brickfield Farm Gardens Orpington BR6 7TE

Proposal: Two storey side extension



"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.