

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 14/04294/FULL6

Ward:
Petts Wood And Knoll

Address : 6 Great Thrift Petts Wood Orpington
BR5 1NG

OS Grid Ref: E: 544214 N: 168113

Applicant : Mrs K Evans

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey side and single storey rear extensions

Key designations:

Area of Special Residential Character
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds

Proposal

The proposed extension will form an L-shape and be constructed beyond the rear (NE) and side (SE) elevations of the existing dwelling. An existing detached garage and store will be removed to accommodate the extension. The side element will extend 2.5m in width and incorporate a "cat slide" roof design and a single dormer will be inserted along the front roof slope. The extension will maintain a 1.5m separation to the flank boundary and align with the original part of the house. The single storey rear extension will project 3.0m beyond the rear elevation of the existing house and the proposed two storey side extension. This will entail the removal of an existing conservatory.

Location

The application site is situated within the southern end of Great Thrift, approximately 30 metres beyond its junction with Silverdale Road. The site falls within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character.

Comments from Local Residents

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

- change to front elevation is out of character with surrounding properties and unbalances this pair of semis, and fails to respect ASRC designation
- all other extensions in the road have been built to minimise the alterations to front elevations
- extension is too large
- disproportionate to size and character of existing dwelling
- loss of outlook
- proposal almost exactly matches extension being constructed at No 12 Great Thrift which was previously refused by the Council, and which has been in an unfinished state for much of the year
- bricks being used at No 12 do not match and fail to enhance the environment
- site is in an Area of Special Residential Character which should be protected
- unsuitable extensions should be resisted
- proposal is overpowering for this style of house
- loss of light and visual dominance in regard to neighbouring conservatory
- potential structural damage resulting from this proposal
- proposal will almost double the footprint of the original dwelling
- overdevelopment
- front elevation is of poor design

Comments from Consultees

Not applicable

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
 H10 Areas of Special Residential Character

Planning History

Under ref. 07/02254, planning permission was refused for a two storey side extension on the following grounds:

"The proposed two storey side extension, if permitted, would result in a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene and of the Area of Special Residential Character, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed, and contrary to Policies H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

The proposed two storey side extension would, by reason of its size and siting, be out of character with the existing pair of semi-detached houses as

well as other neighbouring houses along this side of Great Thrift, contrary to Policies H8, H10 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan."

Under ref. 07/03881, a further application for a two storey side extension was refused on the following ground:

"The proposed two storey side extension, if permitted, would result in a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene and of the Area of Special Residential Character, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed and contrary to Policies H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan."

Under ref. 08/00594, planning permission was granted for a two storey side extension which incorporated an increased separation to the flank boundary of 1.5m and a more subservient appearance relative to the original part of the dwelling. That proposal was not subsequently implemented.

Most recently, under ref. 14/01175 planning permission was refused, under delegated authority, in respect of part one/two storey side and single storey rear extensions on the following ground:

"The proposal would, by reason of its design and inadequate side space provision, constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the streetscene, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which this Area of Special Residential Character is at present developed and contrary to Policies H8, H9, H10 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan."

In addition to the above permission has been granted at appeal for extensions to No. 12 Great Thrift, comprising of two storey side and single storey rear extensions, together with a single dormer to the front roof slope (LBB Ref: 13/04079/FULL6; Appeal Ref: APP/G5180/D/14/2214865). That followed the Council's decision to refuse the proposal on the following ground:

"The front dormer, by reason of its size and design, would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and harmful to the character and appearance of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character contrary to Policies H8 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan."

The Council did not raise objections in respect of spatial/side space standards, since the proposal incorporated a wider gap to the flank boundary at the front of the extension of 1.695m. That scheme also included revisions to two previous applications, both of which had been refused by the Council, including once at appeal.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character and appearance of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential

Character (ASRC) and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

Policy H10 of the UDP advises that applications for development in the ASRCs will be required to respect and complement the established and individual qualities of the individual areas. This policy is supported by Appendix I of the UDP which sets out the criteria by which ASRCs have been designated:

- (i) There should be a sufficient number of properties to form an area of distinctive character. The area should be well established, readily identifiable and coherent.
- (ii) The majority of properties should generally have the same readily identifiable characteristics (e.g. high spatial standards, similar materials, well landscaped frontages).
- (iii) The boundary should be easily defined and defensible.
- (iv) The areas defined should be primarily residential in character.

Appendix I goes on to say that, when considering applications for new development in ASRCs, the Council, as well as applying the general housing policies in Chapter 4 of the UDP, will seek a number of development control guidelines for such areas, including the following:

- Developments likely to erode the individual quality and character of the ASRCs will be resisted. Reference will be made to the description of areas given below for a determination of individual quality and character.
- Residential density shall accord with that existing in the area.
- Spatial standards of new development (plot width, garden depth and plot ratio) shall accord with the general pattern in the area.
- The general height of existing buildings in the area shall not be exceeded.
- The space between a proposed two or more storey development and the side boundary of the site should accord with that prevailing in the area.
- Existing mature trees and landscaping shall be retained wherever possible.

The prevailing character of Great Thrift (and of the ASRC in general) is characterised by generous standards of separation amongst the properties. The Council considers that the development of two storey development within 1 metre of the boundary will, except in some rare exceptions, result in a pattern for undesirable development in the area, and this will ultimately undermine a key feature which has contributed to the designation of this area as an ASRC.

In addition, Policy H9 states that when considering applications for development comprising two or more storeys in height, where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space. This is considered necessary to protect the high spatial standards and level of visual amenity which characterise many of the Borough's residential areas.

Numerous side extensions have been built within the Petts Wood ASRC, many of which have been restricted to single storey height, and consequently their impact on spatial and separation standards are more limited than two storey extensions,

and they are also visually less imposing. Consequently, the distinct character of the street has largely been preserved, with the original character of the area remaining readily identifiable.

Since adopting its current Unitary Development Plan in 2006 the Council has sought to restrain such development which will compromise the spatial standards of the ASRC. This approach has been consistently reflected in decisions which the Council has made, typically involving proposals to erect two storey extensions within 1 metre proximity of the boundary or designed in a manner at odds with the prevailing character of the area. This approach has been reinforced by a number of Appeal Decisions made since 2006. The Council has encouraged applicants to adopt a greater separation between extensions and boundaries, particularly for proposals which are two or more stories in height. The Council considers that it has largely succeeded in achieving this objective with most proposals for two storey side extensions now including at least a 1.5m separation between the development and the flank boundary of the property.

As noted above, under ref. 14/00175, planning permission was refused in respect of a part one/two storey side extension since it was considered that it would constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the streetscene, and conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards. This criticism was mainly attributed to the lack of side space separation between the part one/two storey side extension and the southern flank boundary. In comparison to that scheme, this proposal increases the separation between the side extension and the flank boundary from 1.0m to 1.5m. There has been an accompanying reduction in the width of the side extension, which has fallen from 3.0m to 2.5m.

Taking account of the above changes, it is considered that the concerns raised in respect of the previous planning application have been satisfactorily addressed as a result of the changes made since the site was previously considered: the reduced 2.5m width of the side extension will ensure that the overall character of the dwelling is preserved with the proposed roof configuration replicating the existing design at the front. As noted above, front dormers of a similar design have been approved elsewhere within the street, whilst the provision of conservation rooflights along the front roofslope will ensure that these maintain a more subdued and traditional appearance within the frontage. Furthermore, the 1.5m separation to the flank boundary will maintain much of the existing view to the rear of the dwelling - a feature which contributes to the character and appearance of this ASRC.

Turning to the issue of neighbouring amenity, it is noted that a single storey rear conservatory extension has been added to the adjoining semi at No. 8. Although the existing conservatory at No. 6 will be replaced by a more solid structure, given the 3.0m depth of the proposed single storey rear extension, and the existence of the aforementioned conservatory at No. 8, it is considered that the overall impact of this proposal on neighbouring amenity will be acceptable.

Taking account of the above, planning permission is recommended for this proposal.

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

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 Details of the proposed front rooflights, including their materials, methods of opening and sectional drawings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The rooflights shall be installed in accordance with the approved details before the residential use is first implemented, and retained as such permanently thereafter.
 ACC03R Reason C03
- 4 ACI17 No additional windows (2 inserts) first floor flank extension
 ACI17R I17 reason (1 insert) BE1
- 5 ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan
 ACC03R Reason C03

Application:14/04294/FULL6

Address: 6 Great Thrift Petts Wood Orpington BR5 1NG

Proposal: Part one/two storey side and single storey rear extensions



"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.