

Committee Date	05.08.2021	
Address	3 Nightingale Road Petts Wood Orpington BR5 1BG	
Application Number	21/00533/FULL6	Officer - Jennie Harrison
Ward	Petts Wood and Knoll	
Proposal	Part one/two storey rear and single storey side extensions	
Applicant	Agent Mr Michael Callaghan	
3 Nightingale Road Petts Wood Orpington BR5 1BG		N/A
Reason for referral to committee	Councillor Call in	Councillor call in Yes

RECOMMENDATION	Application permitted
-----------------------	-----------------------

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

Land use Details		
	Use Class or Use description	Floor space (GIA SQM)
Existing	C3	100.6

Proposed	C3 (no change proposed)	133.8
----------	-------------------------	-------

Vehicle parking	Existing number of spaces	Total proposed including spaces retained	Difference in spaces (+ or -)
Standard car spaces	2	2	0
Disabled car spaces	0	0	0
Cycle	0	0	0

Electric car charging points	0
------------------------------	---

Representation summary	Neighbour letters issued –16.03.2021 Neighbour letters issued (amended plans) – 27.05.21 Neighbour letters issued (amended plans) – 08.07.21
Total number of responses	18
Number in support	0
Number of objections	18

1. SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The proposed rear extension would be set in from the boundary with number 1 which would mitigate the impact of the extension
- The side extension would be similar in appearance to others in the immediate vicinity and would have no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or street scene
- The scale of the first floor rear extension would have no harmful impact on either adjoining occupiers at numbers 1 or 5

2. LOCATION

- 2.1 The application site hosts a two storey semi-detached dwelling on the Southern side Nightingale Road, Petts Wood.

2.3 Site Location Plan:



3. PROPOSAL

- 3.1 The application proposes a single storey rear extension that would have a depth of 3m, a height of 3.3m and would have a width of 4.9m. The application also proposes a single storey side extension that would have a depth of 4.3m, a width of 2.6m, an eaves height of 2.6m and a ridge height of 4m.
- 3.2 Plans have been amended so that the ground floor rear extension is set in 2m from the boundary with number 1 and the first floor extension nearest this boundary has also been reduced in width.
- 3.3 The application also proposes a first floor rear extension that would have a depth of 3m, a width of 3.5m, an eaves height of 5.5m and a ridge height of 7.2m.
- 3.4 Existing plans:



3.5 Proposed plans:



4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

4.1 There is no relevant planning history on the site.

5. CONSULTATION SUMMARY

A) Statutory

5.1 None

B) Local Groups

5.2 Petts Wood Residents Association:

- Loss of amenity, light and privacy for number 1 as a result of total 6m extension
- Orientation means a loss of light will be felt by both properties either side
- Tunnelling effect for adjoining property

C) Neighbouring occupiers

5.3 Objections

5.3.1 Neighbouring amenity

- Loss of privacy and overlooking
- Loss of light and overshadowing
- Noise and disturbance created by the extensions
- Overbearing at a total of 6m deep
- Loss of views from living room, patio and garden
- Loss of light to living room and bathroom
- Loss of privacy due to additional glazing
- Size of dwelling would be out of character
- Would create unrelated terracing
- Flat roof would cause security issues
- Concern regarding foundations
- Guttering may cause issues for adjoining occupiers
- Dominant design would be out of character
- Reduction in width would not make a significant difference to loss of sunlight at number 1
- Revised design would still create tunnelling
- Query regarding position of kitchen extract fan

5.3.2 Overdevelopment

- Development is obtrusive and overbearing
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Significant increase in size of the property - disproportionate to the original dwelling

- Extension would have impact on structural integrity of adjoining properties
- Impact on quality of life of the adjoining occupants

6. POLICIES AND GUIDANCE

- 6.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-
- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
 - (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
 - (c) any other material considerations.
- 6.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.3 The development plan for Bromley comprises the London Plan (March 2016) and the Bromley Local Plan (2019). The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.
- 6.4 The application fails to be determined in accordance with the following policies:-

6.5 National Policy Framework 2021

6.6 The London Plan

D1 London's form, character and capacity for growth
D4 Delivering good design

6.7 Bromley Local Plan 2019

6 Residential Extensions
37 General Design of Development

6.8 Bromley Supplementary Guidance

Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 - General Design Principles
Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 - Residential Design Guidance

7. ASSESSMENT

- Design – Layout and scale
- Residential Amenity

7.1 Design – Layout and scale - Acceptable

- 7.1.1 Design is a key consideration in the planning process. Good design is an important aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning,

and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The NPPF states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

- 7.1.2 London Plan and Bromley Local Plan policies further reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality design.
- 7.1.3 The side extension would be visible from the front of the dwelling and would incorporate a pitched roof at the front to reflect the main dwelling. This side extension is not considered to cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or street scene.
- 7.1.4 The single storey rear extension would introduce a significant expanse of flat roof to the rear of the property, however this type of extension is not uncommon in a residential setting such as this and the use of matching materials together with the roof at first floor would not cause any significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
- 7.1.5 Having regard to the form, scale, siting and proposed materials it is considered that the proposed extension(s) would complement the host property and would not appear out of character with surrounding development or the area generally.

7.2 Residential amenity – Acceptable

- 7.2.1 Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan seeks to protect existing residential occupiers from inappropriate development. Issues to consider are the impact of a development proposal upon neighbouring properties by way of overshadowing, loss of light, overbearing impact, overlooking, loss of privacy and general noise and disturbance.
- 7.2.2 The ground floor side extension, whilst creating some tunnelling at the front entrance to number 5 is not considered to have any significantly detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers at either side of the host property.
- 7.2.3 The property currently benefits from a 3m deep rear extension and the proposal would create an additional 3m in depth to this rear extension giving a total rearward projection of 6m. The dwelling at number 1 does not benefit from any rear extensions. The extension at ground floor would be set 2m in from the common boundary with number 1 and it is considered that this separation distance would help to mitigate the impact of the proposed ground floor extension to an acceptable degree.
- 7.2.4 The first floor extension would be set 2m away from the common boundary with number 1 and would have a depth of 3m, it is considered that, on balance, the harm of the first floor extension would not be so significant as to warrant refusal of the application, given the degree of separation from the boundary that is proposed

- 7.2.5 The adjoining occupiers at number 5 benefit from a rear extension which is approximately 2.5m deep at both ground and first floor, as such it is considered that an additional depth of 3m at ground floor would not have any significantly detrimental impact on this adjoining occupier.
- 7.2.6 The first floor extension is set in 1.4m from the common boundary with number 5 and given the extensions at number 5 together with this separation distance it is considered that on balance there would be no significantly detrimental impact on this adjoining occupier.
- 7.2.7 Having regard to the scale, siting and separation distance of the development, it is considered that no significant loss of amenity with particular regard to light, outlook, prospect and privacy would arise.

8. CONCLUSION

- 8.1 Having had regard to the above it is 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.
- 8.2 Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the files set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: Application Permitted
As amended by documents received 08.07.2021

Subject to the following conditions

- 1. Standard time limit**
- 2. Compliance with plans**
- 3. Matching Materials**