

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

**Application No :** 11/01338/FULL6

**Ward:**  
**Farnborough And Crofton**

**Address :** 15 St Thomas Drive Orpington BR5 1HE

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 544411 N: 166131

**Applicant :** Mr K Greese

**Objections :** YES

**Description of Development:**

Part one/two storey side and rear extension and side dormer extension to form habitable room in roof with roof lights to side and rear.

Key designations:

- Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
- Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
- London City Airport Safeguarding

**Proposal**

Planning permission is sought for a part one/two storey side and rear extension, to include a side dormer to form a habitable room in the roofspace, with rooflights to the side and rear. The full details of the proposal are as follows:

- Side extension 2.53m in width, with side space of 1m to flank boundary
- To project beyond the rear wall of the property with maximum depth of approx. 3.9m at ground and first floor (minimum depth approx. 3m from existing rear wall where adjacent to No. 11a), with first floor set in 3.685m from western flank wall
- Double doors to be inserted to western flank wall at ground floor level
- 2 windows to eastern flank at first floor level serving bathrooms
- 2 rooflights to western flank roofslope, 1 to eastern flank roofslope and 2 to rear roofslope including proposed dormer

In addition it is indicated that the driveway would be increased in width.

Amended plans were received on 7th June 2011 to show the proposed double doors to the western flank wall (which had previously been omitted from the elevation drawing) and to include the proposed staircase to the loft room on the proposed first floor plan (which had been previously omitted from the drawing).

**Location**

The application property is located on the southern side of St Thomas Drive, and comprises a detached dwellinghouse. The surrounding area comprises a mix of detached and semi-detached properties.

### **Comments from Local Residents**

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

- 113% increase in floorspace would represent overdevelopment of the site
- Out of keeping with properties in the area
- setting a precedent especially as previous and much smaller developments have been refused (including single storey rear extension at No. 7 St Thomas Drive)
- Proposed removal of garage and increased area of hardstanding sets a precedent entirely out of keeping with the area
- Look of property will be changed
- Size of extension will greatly interfere with adjacent neighbours enjoyment of privacy of back gardens
- Plan for single storey extension refused at No. 7 on these grounds
- Loss of sunlight
- Dormer windows will overlook neighbouring gardens
- Rear of properties follow a general line with no existing double storey extensions
- Dramatically cut out light to neighbours
- Development very large
- Loss of trees and wildlife
- Extension aesthetically out of character with surroundings and neighbouring houses
- Loss of light
- Overshadowing
- Loss of view
- Terracing effect
- Question as to whether existing wall will be removed to front boundary
- Extreme infill
- Rooflights ugly addition to property
- Overdominant dormer
- Approval would create a detrimental precedent
- Loss of prospect and overshadowing
- Dormer will appear overdominant and result in overlooking and loss of light
- Rear extension will create overshadowing, eliminating direct late afternoon and evening sunshine to windows of kitchen, back door and utility room at 11a, and also to patio
- Front boundary walls are feature of road and its removal should be resisted
- Irreversible precedent would be established
- No. 17 already overshadowed by No. 17, proposed rear extension will completely overshadow kitchen/breakfast room to this property, which is main living area of house
- Sunlight will be completely blocked from No. 17
- Concerns regarding doors to flank elevation and noise and disturbance

## **Comments from Consultees**

Highways raise no objection to the proposal.

## **Planning Considerations**

The main policies against which this application falls to be considered are as follows:

Unitary Development Plan

BE1 Design of New Development

H8 Residential Extensions

H9 Side Space

## **Planning History**

There is no recent planning history at the site.

## **Conclusions**

The main issues for consideration in this case will be the impact of the proposed extensions to the character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

The proposed works would involve a two storey side extension which would be positioned 1m from the boundary with 11a St Thomas Road. Other examples of two storey side extensions to similar detached properties exist in the vicinity, and in principle it is not considered that this element of the proposed works would appear out of character with adjacent development, while the provision of the minimum 1m side space would be sufficient to comply with the requirements of Policy H9 and prevent a retrograde terracing effect. The proposed side extension would also incorporate a side dormer extension, which would be of relatively modest dimensions being set below the ridge, and well back from the front and rear of the house. Accordingly it is not considered that this element would be unduly prominent, nor harmful to the character of the area.

Regarding the impact of the proposed extensions to the amenities of neighbouring properties, Members will note that strong objections have been received, particularly from the neighbouring properties at 11a and 17 St Thomas Drive. From an amenity point of view these objections appear primarily to relate to loss of light, prospect, overlooking, and the visual impact of the proposed extensions. The proposed two storey side and rear extensions would clearly result in a change to the local environment for these properties given the close-knit residential area that the site is located within, however it is a question of assessing the severity of any impact and not the existence of an impact alone that should be the determining factor as to whether planning permission can be granted or should be refused on amenity grounds.

In this case, the proposed side and rear extension would be positioned 1m from the boundary with No. 11a, and project beyond the rear building line of the host property by just under 4m at ground and first floor levels, although given the step in the existing rear elevation the depth is approx. 3m where adjacent to No. 11a. In addition No. 11a would appear to project slightly further rearward than the existing property, meaning that the effective depth of the extension when viewed from this property would be reduced from that indicated on the plans. No. 11a does not appear to have any windows to the flank elevation which serve habitable rooms, while the nearest window at ground floor level appears to serve a utility room. Bearing this in mind, together with the relationship of the two properties and the effective projection of the extension beyond the rear building line to No. 11a, it is not considered that the impact of the proposal would be significant enough to warrant the refusal of planning permission on amenity grounds.

Regarding the impact to No. 17, it is noted that this property is set at an angle to the application site as a result of its corner siting, possessing a triangular shaped plot. Currently views from the rear of No. 17 (particularly from the dining area) are partially obscured by No. 15 and clearly there would be a degree of further impact as a result of the proposed extension. However, the construction would be limited to a single storey to the western side of the property, with the first floor element set well away from this side of the dwelling. Accordingly, and bearing in mind the broadly south-facing orientation of No. 17, it is not considered that the extension would result in a significant visual impact or loss of daylighting or prospect to warrant the refusal of planning permission in this case.

With regard to the concerns raised that the proposal would result in overlooking, windows serving habitable rooms would face rearwards which would result in no greater impact than currently exists, and while two windows are proposed at first floor level to the eastern flank wall, these would serve bathrooms and could be obscurely glazed to prevent any undue impact. In addition, a total of three windows are proposed to the flank roofslopes, together with two windows to the rear roofslope including one in the side dormer. In reality views afforded from roof windows are limited by virtue of the pitch of the roof slope and the effective cill height, however in this case those proposed to be inserted into the flank roofslopes could be obscurely glazed to limit the potential for (or indeed any perception of) overlooking.

Further concerns raised locally relate to the proposed alterations to the driveway and the vehicular access, both of which are indicated on the proposed driveway plans. The increase in the width of an existing vehicular access does not require planning permission, nor would the partial removal of part of the existing front wall. Nevertheless this element of the proposal, together with the proposed parking layout, raise no technical objections from Highways, and with regard to the impact of an enlarged parking area to the street scene and the character of the area, it is noted that provision for soft landscaping would be retained which would soften the visual impact of the additional hard surfacing.

Having regard to the above, Members may agree that on balance, the proposed extensions to the host property are acceptable and that planning permission should

be granted in this case. In order to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents and the character of the area, Members may agree that it would be necessary to ensure that the windows in the first floor flank wall and to the flank roofslopes are obscurely glazed and that no further windows are inserted to the first floor flank walls of the extension, and in addition that the materials to be used for the extension match those of the existing dwelling, all of which could be controlled by appropriately worded planning conditions.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref(s). DC/11/01338, excluding exempt information.  
as amended by documents received on 07.06.2011  
RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1ACA01 Commencement of development within 3 yrs
- ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
- 2ACC04 Matching materials
- ACC04R Reason C04
- 3ACH03 Satisfactory parking - full application
- ACH03R Reason H03
- 4 Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window(s) in the first floor flank wall of the eastern elevation and in the flank roof slopes; shall be obscurely glazed in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.
- ACI12R I12 reason (1 insert) BE1 and H8
- 5ACI17 No additional windows (2 inserts) first floor flank extensions
- ACI17R I17 reason (1 insert)

5 Reasons for granting permission:

In granting permission the Local Planning Authority had regard to the following policies:

- BE1 Design of New Development
- H8 Residential Extensions
- H9 Side Space

The development is considered to be satisfactory in relation to the following:

- (a) the appearance of the development in the street scene
- (b) the relationship of the development to adjacent properties
- (c) the character of the development in the surrounding area
- (d) the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (e) the light and outlook of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties
- (f) the privacy of occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties

(g) the conservation policies of the Unitary Development Plan

And having regard to all other matters raised.

Reference: 11/01338/FULL6

Address: 15 St Thomas Drive Orpington BR5 1HE

Proposal: Part one/two storey side and rear extension and side dormer extension to form habitable room in roof with roof lights to side and rear.



This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Bromley. Lic. No: 100017661