

Section '3' - Applications recommended for PERMISSION, APPROVAL or CONSENT

Application No : 15/02628/FULL6

Ward:
Petts Wood And Knoll

Address : 2 Nightingale Road Petts Wood
Orpington BR5 1BG

OS Grid Ref: E: 544302 N: 167498

Applicant : Mr Robert Wildman

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey side/rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 8

Proposal

It is proposed to add a part one/two storey side/rear extension adjacent to the access road to the east, along with a first floor rear extension and a front porch.

The part one/two storey side extension would be set back a minimum 0.2m from the flank boundary with the access road, and would project up to the rear of the existing single storey rear extension at ground floor level (4.2m from the original rear wall of the dwelling). The two storey element and first floor rear extension would project 2.7m to the rear, and would be set back 2.4m from the western flank boundary with No.4.

Location

This semi-detached property is located on the north-western side of Nightingale Road, adjacent to an access road which serves commercial properties in Queensway. The property currently has a 4.2m deep single storey rear extension.

Consultations

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 2015 (ref.14/04861) for roof alterations to incorporate a rear dormer and a part one/two storey side/rear extension on the following grounds:

"The proposals would include substantial alteration to the existing roof line of the property which would appear overdominant within the street scene, and would be detrimental to the symmetrical appearance of this pair of semi-detached houses, thereby contrary to Policies H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan."

The subsequent appeal was dismissed on grounds relating to the ungainly size and design of the roof extensions and the overbearing expanse of the side wall of the extension when viewed from the side access road.

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are the impact of the proposals on the character and spatial standards of the surrounding area and on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

The proposals differ from the scheme previously dismissed on appeal in that the roof accommodation has now been removed, resulting in a far less bulky roof design, and the first floor element has been reduced in overall depth by 1.5m. The part of the first floor closest to the adjoining semi has increased in depth from 2m to 2.7m, but it would still be set 2.4m away from the flank boundary to protect the amenities of the adjoining property. Furthermore, the expanse of the side elevation has been reduced by the reduction in the depth of the first floor element and the less bulky design of the roof, and would not now appear unduly overbearing when viewed from the side access road.

As with the previous scheme, the proposed two storey side extension would fall within 1m of the side boundary of the property, and would not, strictly speaking, comply with the Council's side space policy. However, the extension would be adjacent to a side access road, and the nearest properties would be some 20m away, thus lessening the impact on the street scene.

Other properties nearby have similar two storey side extensions with a hipped roof design (eg. 1, 12, 13 and 15), and the proposals would not therefore appear out of character with the area.

With regard to the impact on residential amenity, the adjoining property at No.4 has a similar sizeable single storey rear extension, and the proposed first floor rear extension would project only 2.7m to the rear set back 2.4m from the flank boundary. The proposals are not, therefore, considered to have a detrimental impact on light, privacy or prospect to the adjoining property.

In conclusion, the revised proposals are considered to adequately overcome the previous Inspector's concerns.

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 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.**

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and / or drawings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

- 3 No windows or doors shall at any time be inserted in the western flank elevation(s) of the first floor rear extension hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.**

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

- 4 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.