

MINUTE ANNEX

APPENDIX 3

London Borough of Bromley Plans Sub-Committee 1 – 3 March 2016

ITEM SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA S8.1 – (15/05056/FULL6)

67 Dale Wood Road, Orpington BR6 0BY

COMMENTS RECEIVED AT THE MEETING FROM SUB-COMMITTEE AND WARD MEMBER, COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS AULD.

Madam Chairman,

This application was originally on the agenda for Sub-Committee 4 on 18 February but was deferred. On that basis my Ward colleague, Councillor Simon Fawthrop, visited the adjoining property at no. 65 as the occupiers of that house had concerns over the proposal in respect of further loss of sunlight and daylight into their rear lounge and onto their patio.

Following his visit, Councillor Fawthrop forwarded an email and photographs which are before you this evening. The contents of his email have been read.

On Tuesday I visited both nos 67 and 65 Dale Wood Road. Like Councillor Fawthrop I believe the current application is a vast improvement in that, at first floor level the width of the proposed extension has been reduced by 3.1 metres thereby increasing the space to the boundary to 5.58 metres at that level.

In concurring with Councillor Fawthrop I consider that the extension in this application in itself is acceptable but I saw for myself that the roof of the extension would still cause further shadowing and loss of light to the rear lounge and patio of no 65. The resident there stated the shadowing was at its worst in the winter months. In my opinion height and not width or depth is the difficulty.

The rear lounge of no. 65 is situated adjacent to the boundary of no. 67. It is lit by a flank window and by patio doors to the rear. Light from the flank window is almost totally obscured by the wall of a single storey garage, part of no. 67 which is about one metre from the flank window.

Due to the orientation of the houses, the direction of the sunlight and a single storey rear extension to no 67 permitted in 2005, there is already restricted light reaching the patio and the patio doors of no 65. In terms of light the lounge is already a dull room. Therefore anything which further impeded that light would be detrimental to the occupants of no 65.

In her report the planning officer states, (page 3, second paragraph), 'the proposal should not affect privacy or loss of light. Neither Councillor Fawthrop or myself agree as regards the loss of light.

There have been three previous applications for a first floor rear extension to no 67. As you will have noted from the report all three were refused by the Council. The last, early last year, went to Appeal. In dismissing the Appeal the Planning Inspector concluded that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at no 65, in terms of loss of light and outlook and that the scheme would not accord with Unitary Development Policy BE1 in this regard. It is obvious the Inspector was partially concerned with loss of light.

This application goes a fair way to address the Inspector's concerns. However if it was to proceed as it is I would propose refusal on the grounds of loss of amenity (light) to the occupants of no 65. There may be a middle path if the applicant was to either substantially reduce the slope of the roof of the extension or to have a flat roof on it thereby reducing the height.

I move deferral to give the applicant the opportunity to consider amending the design of the roof with the objective of reducing the height.

Thank you

Councillor Douglas Auld