

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

Application No : 16/00244/FULL6

Ward:
Cray Valley West

Address : 15 Sutherland Avenue Petts Wood
Orpington BR5 1QX

OS Grid Ref: E: 545553 N: 167343

Applicant : Mr N Charman

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey rear extension

Key designations:

Area of Special Residential Character
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 9

Proposal

The application seeks permission for a part one/two storey rear extension.

The proposed ground floor part of the extension has a depth of 3.5m from the existing single storey element. It would have a width of 4m with a maximum height of 3.8m and eaves height of 3m. The first floor element has a depth of 3.7m from the existing first floor rear projection and would square of the property to the rear at first floor level.

Location

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling located on the western side of Sutherland Avenue, close to the junction with Elysian Avenue. The site is not located within a conservation area, nor is it listed.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

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

The application site has been the subject of the following previous applications;

- o 82/612 - Single storey front / rear extension - Permitted 20.05.82
- o 09/01881/FULL6 - Part one/two storey side and first floor front extensions - Permitted 25.08.2009.
- o 15/04316/FULL6 - Part one/two storey rear extension, alterations to roof to form habitable accommodation including side dormer and juliet balcony to rear. - Refused 19.11.2015

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 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.

The part one/two storey rear extension would project 3.5m rearwards with a width of 4m at ground floor level, and 3.7m rearwards with a width of 3.5m at first floor level. The flank elevation would contain two windows at ground floor level and the roof would include one rooflight. The materials proposed would match the existing dwelling.

The application site was recently the subject of a similar application for a part one/two storey rear extension, alterations to roof to form habitable accommodation including side dormer and Juliet balcony to rear. The application ref: 15/04316 was refused on the following grounds;

1. The proposal did not comply with the Council's requirement for a minimum 1 metre side space to be maintained, contrary to Policy H9 of the UDP.
2. Its excessive bulk and design would result in an over dominant and incongruous addition to the host dwelling, harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the area.
3. The proposed windows and Juliet balcony located on the second floor rear elevation would result in an overly dominant and unacceptable design detrimental to the appearance of the host dwelling and leading to a perceived overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

The current application has removed the roof alterations, side dormer and Juliet balcony from the application and this has significantly reduced the bulk of the scheme. The addition of the part one/two storey element only is not considered to result in a bulky or incongruous addition to the host dwelling.

The amended scheme would also significantly reduce the opportunity for overlooking given the removal of the Juliet balcony and windows in the roof space. The part one/two storey extension would have two windows in the flank elevation at ground floor level however this is unlikely to result in a significant loss of privacy to warrant a refusal. The flank elevation would have no windows at first floor level and a condition will be added to prevent any windows being added to the first floor flank elevation in order to protect the privacy of the adjoining neighbour. The proposal also includes the addition of a window in the existing first floor flank elevation, however this would be obscure glazed.

On balance, it is therefore considered that the proposed extension is unlikely to result in a significant increase in bulk to the host dwelling, or cause any significant loss of privacy to neighbours. Given the above, the current scheme is considered sufficient to overcome the second and third refusal grounds.

With regards to the first refusal ground, Policy H9 states that a space of 1 metre should be retained for the entire height and length of a proposed flank elevation of two or more stories in height. The proposed extension is identical to that previously proposed, and would provide a minimum side space of 0.96m from the flank boundary. The proposal would therefore still be contrary to Policy H9.

The proposed extension would not project any closer to the boundary than the existing flank wall. Further to this the first floor element would be set in approximately 1.46m from the boundary. In this case whilst Policy H9 would therefore not strictly be adhered to it is not considered that the extension would result in a cramped appearance or unrelated terracing from occurring, particularly given that the significant bulk of the previously proposed roof alterations are not included within this application.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area.

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 Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall as far as is practicable match those of the existing building.**

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 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.

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

REASON: In order to comply with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.