

# MINUTE ANNEX

## APPENDIX 2

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 READ AND CIRCULATED AT THE MEETING FROM**

**WARD MEMBER, COUNCILLOR SIMON FAWTHROP.**

The crux of this application is the impact it will have on the neighbours at 65 Dale Wood Road. The gardens in this case are roughly north facing.

As can be seen from the photographs the occupants of no. 65 already have impeded access to daylight due to the proximity of the existing development at no. 67.

In fairness to no. 67 the revised development for the extension is a huge improvement on the previous application being set back by half the width of the existing building. If this were of a flat roof variety of extension the impact whilst detrimental to the amenities of No. 65 would be substantially less than what is currently proposed. Unfortunately the pitched roof adds to the over shadowing at no. 65. Which is a shame because in design terms the pitched roof is more pleasing than a flat roof.

For a long time as members we have had to rely on our judgement to determine the impact of proposed developments on neighbouring properties due to overshadowing. With the link I have forwarded we are able to enter the post code and then a time of day to assess the shadowing impact of a proposed development. In this case I have taken a date of 21st March to assess the impact at midday on the equinox a time when if you like we can determine the average impact upon the amenities of no. 65.

If colleagues enter this date into a link attached to my email of 28 February 2016 they will see that the shadow is approximately 3 times the length of the extension. Making the overshadowing impact on no. 65. Substantial, this is in the main due to the height of the roof rather than the extension its self.

This leads to a conclusion that as it stands the proposal should be refused as being contrary to policy BE1.

If colleagues are not with me on this then at the very least the application should be deferred to seek a reduction in the roof slope, to reduce the impact of overshadowing on no. 65.

Regards

Simon Fawthrop

