

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

**Application No :** 14/01545/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Kelsey And Eden Park**

**Address :** 96 Bramerton Road Beckenham BR3  
3PD

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 537026 N: 168633

**Applicant :** Mr Richard Watts

**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

**Proposal**

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension 3.0m deep and 8.5m wide to provide an enlarged kitchen/breakfast room and additional sitting room. The extension would have a pitched roof with eaves at 2.6m and an overall ridge height of 3.4m. The extension would be set 0.625m away from the western boundary with No.94 Bramerton Road.

A single storey side extension to create a utility room is also proposed on the eastern side elevation. This will be 1.85m wide and 3.1m deep with a pitched roof.

**Location**

Bramerton Road is a residential street made up predominantly semi-detached houses. The road experiences a sharp change in level moving down the street from east to west.

Members will note that the submitted drawings indicate that No.94 Bramerton Road (to the west of the site) sits approximately 1.0m lower in its plot than No.96.

**Comments from Local Residents**

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

- No.94 already has lower levels of natural light and outlook due to the 'stepped terrace' nature of the site
- the proposed rear extension would be overbearing and overshadow No.94
- No.94 in fact sits 1.5m to 2.0m lower than No.96
- the extension will impact the side aspect from the upstairs rear windows of No.94
- the extension would be out of keeping with the design of the original terrace
- the skylights in the roof of the rear extension will impinge on privacy at No.94

### **Comments from Consultees**

No internal consultations were required in this instance.

### **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

The above policies are considered to be consistent with the principles and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework which is a key consideration in the determination of this application.

### **Planning History**

In 1987, under ref. 86/03420, permission was granted for a first floor rear extension.

### **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.

The host property sits within a tapered plot, and the proposed side extension would be modest in scale, set well back from the principle elevation and within an existing covered area to the side of the property.. The relatively modest height and design is such that the proposed side extension will not be overly visible in the streetscene or nearby properties, and any impact on amenity would be minimal.

With regard to the rear extension, Members will note that the relationship between the host property and the adjoining property (No.94) is unusual in that there is a sharp change in level moving down the street from east to west. It is considered that the proposed depth of 3.0m is not excessive given the size of the host dwelling, with the eaves height of 2.6m and overall height of 3.4m generally considered to be within acceptable parameters for extensions of this nature.

However, Members should have regard for the relationship between the host property and No.94, and Members will note the comments of the adjoining occupants.

Having undertaken a site visit, it is considered that the design - stepped in from the boundary by 0.625m - existing vegetation at the shared boundary and relatively low eaves height means that, on balance, the impact of the extension on the amenity of No.94 is not considered to be so great as to warrant refusal of planning permission.

The application site was visited by the case officer and the aims and objectives of the above policies, national and regional planning guidance, all other material planning considerations including any objections, other representations and relevant planning history on the site were taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

On balance, having had regard to the above, Members may consider that the scale and design of the proposed extensions are not excessive, and the proposed design (stepped away from the shared boundary) will not give rise to a significant loss of amenity to adjacent residents.

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

#### **RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

Subject to the following conditions:

- |   |                 |  |
|---|-----------------|--|
| 1 | ACA01<br>ACA01R | Commencement of development within 3 yrs<br>A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2 | ACC04<br>ACC04R | Matching materials<br>Reason C04                               |
| 3 | ACK01<br>ACK05R | Compliance with submitted plan<br>K05 reason                   |

