

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

**Application No :** 16/00791/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Bickley**

**Address :** 260 Southlands Road Bromley BR1 2EQ

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 542344 N: 168382

**Applicant :** Mr & Mrs M Wilson

**Objections : YES**

**Description of Development:**

Two storey side and single storey rear extensions

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Smoke Control SCA 13  
Smoke Control SCA 12

**Proposal**

The proposal involves a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension which would replace an existing attached garage.

The proposed two storey side extension would have a width of between 2.1m at the front and 1.85m to the rear with a depth that would extend for the full flank elevation of the dwelling. The extension would have a pitched roof which would be hipped and would have a height of 8.3 m.

The proposed single storey rear extension would have a rearward projection of between 3m and 3.8m as a result of the staggered rear elevation of the property. The rear extension would have a mono pitched roof with a maximum height of 3.8m.

Amended plans were received 10th May 2016 which reduced the height of the proposed extension so that it is stepped down by 250mm from the ridge of the original roof and the front elevation of the extension is set back at first floor by 250mm.

**Location**

The area mainly consists of semi-detached, family dwellings with the neighbouring property to the east of the application site being a residential home for the elderly. However, between the application site and the residential home there is an electricity sub station.

## **Consultations**

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

- o Will invade privacy
- o Enough building works in the area and will impact on neighbours
- o Extension will have a direct view of nearby gardens

## **Comments from Consultees**

From a technical Highways point of view the development would result in a loss of one parking space however there are spaces available in the site curtilage which can be utilised for parking. On balance as it is a small proposal no technical highways objections are raised subject to a standard condition.

## **Planning Considerations**

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development  
H8 Residential Extensions  
H9 Side Space  
T18 Road Safety

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 1 General Design Principles  
Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2 Residential Design Guidance

## **Conclusions**

The side element of the proposal would have two storeys and would be built right up to the flank boundary

The main issues relating to the application are:

- o the effect it is likely to have on the character and appearance of the area,
- o the impact it would have on the spatial standards of the local area
- o the impact 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 proposal is similar in design and scale to a previous application granted permission under ref. 09/01959, however the proposal was not implemented and the permission has now lapsed. The proposal site, whilst having a large garden, is

relatively narrow and the proposed extension being hard up to the flank boundary is therefore contrary to the Council's side space policy. However, Members may consider that in this instance, the proposal is unlikely to result in unrelated terracing due to the land adjacent to it. This land accommodates an electricity sub station and is therefore very unlikely to be developed. There would be a separation of approx. 6.7m at its narrowest between Draper Court and the proposed two storey side extension and therefore Members may consider that the proposal is unlikely to result in a cramped appearance, nor is it likely to lead to an unacceptable loss of visual amenity to the surrounding area or a detrimental impact on the spatial standards of the area, therefore it complies with the overall aims of Policy H9.

Since the previous application was permitted (ref. 09/01959), a development for two detached houses has been carried out to the rear of site which was granted planning permission under ref. 13/02136, the frontages of these dwellings face onto the rear of Nos. 260 and No. 258. In particular, No. 258a has a frontage partially looking towards the rear of No. 260, however it is set back from the east flank boundary, therefore the additional bulk proposed along to the east flank of No. 260 would be viewed only obliquely. As a result the proposal is not considered to have a significant impact on the outlook of No. 258a. This neighbouring property is situated around 38.3m from the proposed rear building line of No. 260. Given the above, the proposal is not considered to result in any loss of light or outlook and the proposal would not be harmful to the visual amenities of this neighbouring property.

The proposed two storey element has been set back from the front of the property and the ridge line of the extension would be slightly lower than the ridge height of the original dwelling which would be subservient to the existing property. Members may consider that this element, due to its design and relatively modest size, is unlikely to have significant impact in the streetscene and is unlikely to harm the visual amenities of adjoining owners.

The single storey element to the rear would have maximum rearward projection of 3.8m. However, along the west flank boundary it would have a depth of 3m beyond the rear building line of No. 258 although this is not considered to be excessive. Additionally, the rear extension would have a mono-pitched roof with an eaves height of 2.7m which is minimal. Currently the properties have level rear elevations with both properties having small rear projections of around 0.8m in depth which would lessen the amount of bulk visible from the adjoining dwelling and it is therefore unlikely to result in a significant loss of light or outlook to the neighbouring property. There are no windows in the flank elevation and it may be considered that this element of the proposal is unlikely to lead to a loss of privacy to either neighbouring properties.

There is one window in the first floor flank elevation and ground floor windows to the side of Draper Court. The properties are separated by a gap of between 7.1 and 6.1m and the buildings extend a considerable distance along the side of the garden of the application site. It may be considered that the two storey element will have an adequate separation to prevent a serious loss of light or outlook to the first floor window at Draper Court and the proposed windows in the flank elevation at ground and first floor will be obscure glazed therefore no loss of privacy is

considered to result to these neighbouring properties. As for the proposed single storey element, it will not have windows in its flank elevation, thereby reducing any potential overlooking and loss of privacy to those living at Draper Court.

Whilst the proposal is not compliant with the Council's side space policy, Members may consider that on balance, the proposed is acceptable in that it is unlikely to result in a cramped appearance in the streetscene and is unlikely to have a seriously harmful impact on surrounding residents, therefore broadly complying with the aims of Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Amended plans were received 10th May 2016 which reduced the height of the proposed extension so that it is stepped down by 250mm from the ridge of the original roof and the front elevation of the extension is set back at first floor by 250mm.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref.16/00791, excluding exempt information.

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  
as amended by documents received on 10.05.2016**

**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 additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the first elevations of the extensions hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

**REASON:** In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties