SECTION ‘1’ – Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley

1. Application No : 07/01277/DEEM3 Ward: Chislehurst

Address : Marjorie McClure School Hawkwood Lane Chislehurst Kent BR7 5PS

Conservation Area: Chislehurst

OS Grid Ref: E: 544300 N: 169551

Applicant : Marjorie McClure School

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Single storey infill extension to north facing elevation

Proposal

The application site is a London Borough Of Bromley owned education facility serving pupils who have physical and social impairments. The school of mixed aged pupils is located in Hawkwood Lane Chislehurst.

The existing courtyard area is adjacent to an existing play area and is currently accessed by automated sliding doors.

The proposal seeks permission for a single storey infill extension to an existing courtyard area. The proposal will create a large internal activity area which is fully accessible by wheelchair users. The extension will not have any impact on the current parking or travel plans of the school as no additional students or teachers will be recruited as a result of this scheme.
Consultations

Nearby owners/neighbours were notified of the proposal and no representations were received.

The Advisory Panel of Conservation Areas (APCA) were consulted on the application and any comments received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

With regard to heritage and urban design issues any comments will be reported verbally at the meeting.

From a highways point of view no technical concerns raised.

Planning Considerations

The principal policies against which to assess this application are, BE1 ‘Design Of New Development’ and BE11 ‘Conservation Areas’ from the Unitary Development Plan (July 2006)

The Supplementary Planning Guidance for the Chislehurst Conservation Area is a further consideration.

Conclusions

The main issues to consider in this application are, the impact of the extensions on the character and appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area, and the possible effect on the prospect and amenity enjoyed by residents of adjoining properties.

Policy BE1 highlights the need for extensions to buildings to be of a high standard of design and layout complementing the scale, form and materials of adjacent buildings. The proposed extensions and alterations maintain acceptable spatial standards and respect the character and appearance of the locality.

The proposed extension is currently only overlooked by a mobile classroom in the adjoining Coopers School grounds and is unlikely to have any significant effect on any residential properties.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/031277, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1 ACA01 ACA01R Commencement of development 3 years A01 Reason 3 years
2 ACC04 ACC04R Matching materials Reason C04
3 AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
2. Application No: 07/01481/FULL3 Ward: Cray Valley East

Address: Pavilion And Public Conveniences Recreation Ground Park Road Orpington Kent Conservation Area: NO

OS Grid Ref: E: 547367 N: 167594

Applicant: London Borough Of Bromley Objections: NO

Description of Development:

Refurbishment of derelict sports facilities and change of use from changing rooms (Class D2) to childrens centre (Class D1)

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the refurbishment of the sports pavilion on the recreation grounds accessed off Park Road and east of St Mary Cray High Street for the purposes of providing a new ‘Children’s Centre’ as required by the Government’s ‘Sure Start’ programme. The Children’s Centre at this site will provide the following services to local families:

- new nursery for up to 26 children under the age of 5 (primary use);
- occasional training courses for up to 15 parents at any one time (secondary use);
- reception / information desk offering a drop in service for local parents wanting general parenting information.

The pavilion is considered by the applicant to be the best location for the new nursery facilities given its close proximity to the target families.

The pavilion's floor area will not be extended, however a new buggy shelter (5m$^2$ ‘roof’ area) is proposed north of the main entrance to the building. Also, outdoor play areas will be created on the south side of the building and the applicant proposes to erect sun/weather canopies with a ‘roof’ area of approximately 14m$^2$.

A palisade fence, 1.2m in height will enclose the building and provide outdoor areas severed from the recreation ground.
New wheelchair access will be created to the main door of the building (on the west elevation).

All existing windows will be replaced with white UPVC models, and existing doors will be replaced with metal versions, coloured light blue. All doors and windows will be fitted with metal security shutters also coloured light blue.

The external cladding will be repainted white.

The nursery will provide accommodation for 26 children, and will be available from 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday. A maximum of 9 staff will be on site at any one time.

The applicant proposes to use the existing car park facilities south of the pavilion, however it is considered that most users of the Children’s Centre will arrive on foot. The applicant intends on preparing a Travel Plan to encourage the nursery users to travel on foot to the site.

The Children’s Centre proposed to be located at St Mary Cray will be operated in conjunction with the Children’s Centre proposed for Pavilion Manor Oak Primary School (ref. 07/01812).

**Consultations**

To date there have been no comments received from adjoining neighbours or local residents.

Highways considers that there is room for approximately 15 cars in the adjacent car parking area, which given the expected foot traffic should be acceptable. Ensuring by way of condition the parent training courses do not coincide with general school drop off/pick up times will also ensure the proposal will not result in inadequate car parking spaces or have an adverse effect on road safety in the area.

**Planning Considerations**

The Sports Pavilion at the recreation grounds in St Mary Cray is located within the Green Belt.

The proposal requires consideration of Policies BE1, G1, T18, T3, C7 and C1 of the UDP.

Policy BE1 (Design of New Development) requires that any new development be of a high standard of design and layout in order to create an attractive townscape and pleasant living and working conditions.

G1 (Green Belt) states that the re-use of buildings within the green belt will be resisted unless specific criteria are met.

T18 (Road Safety) states that the Council will consider a planning proposal’s potential impact on road safety and will seek to ensure it is not adversely affected.

T3 (Parking) requires off-street parking associated with new developments to meet the standards set out in Appendix II of the UDP.
C1 (Community Facilities) supports changes of use to meet an identified community need provided that the site is accessible by modes of transport other than car, and resists proposals that would result in the loss of a community facility which is being well-used unless a suitable replacement facility is also proposed.

C7 (Education and Pre-School Facilities) supports new pre-school facilities provided they are located so as to maximise access by means of transport other than the car.

Neighbouring residential dwellings are located east of the pavilion only.

Conclusions

The applicant proposes to use the site as a nursery for local children under the age of 5 years old. The new nursery facility is to be provided in accordance with the Government’s ‘Sure Start Children’s Centres’ directive. The sure start programme is targeted at socially deprived areas, and large parts of the Cray Valley East area falls into the ‘most deprived’ bracket, which requires extra child care support between the hours of 8am to 6pm daily. Other nursery facilities in the area are said to offer limited hours of service and do not meet the 10 hour per day core service required by the Government.

The sports pavilion is currently not used and is in a somewhat derelict and untidy state. Whilst the loss of the community sports facility is regrettable, it is no longer used by the community and the new use and refurbishment of the pavilion will improve the visual amenities of the area.

The proposed refurbishment of the building is not expected to have an adverse effect on the valued characteristics of the Green Belt. The proposed buggy shelter and weather shelters are also not expected to have an adverse effect on the Green Belt given their open design.

Given the proposed hours of use, it is considered that neighbouring residential amenities will not be harmed by the development, and these can be controlled by way of a condition.

Having regard to the relevant policies in the UDP, it is considered that the proposed refurbishment and change of use of the pavilion will have benefits to the Cray Valley East community, will not have an adverse effect on the character or setting of the Green Belt, nor would it result in any significant harm to local visual and residential amenities in general.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01481, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2. Details of the storage facilities for buggies shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the extension is first used.
**Reason:** In order to provide adequate facilities for the purposes of the building to accord with Policy C1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

3. A Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied.

**Reason:** In order to comply with Policies T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

4. The children attending the day nursery/play group shall be between the ages of 0 and 5 years and no more than 26 children shall be accommodated at any one time.

**Reason:** In order to ensure the use of the development is as intended and to avoid development without adequate parking provisions, and to comply with Policies T3 and C7 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of nearby properties.

5. Parent training courses hereby permitted shall not start or finish between the hours of 8.30am and 9am or between 2.30pm and 3.30pm.

**Reason:** In order to comply with Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development having an adverse effect on road safety in the area.

6. The hereby permitted nursery use shall not operate before 8am and after 6pm on any day.

**Reason:** In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the area.

7. AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

**Policies (UDP)**
- BE1 Design of new development
- G1 Green Belt
- C7 Educational and pre-school facilities
- C1 Community facilities
- T3 Parking
- T18 Road safety

**INFORMATIVE(S)**

1. You should seek engineering advice from the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre regarding the reinstatement of any damage to the highway. Please contact Dave Thomas of Street Services on 020 8313 4578.

2. Please be aware that permission/approval/consent may be required for any other proposals associated with this application (e.g. signage for the Children's Centre).
3. Application No: 07/01780/DEEM3 Ward: Bromley Common And Keston

Address: Bishop Justus C Of E School Magpie Hall Lane Bromley BR2 8HZ Conservation Area: NO

OS Grid Ref: E: 542395  N: 166787

Applicant: The Governors Of Bishop Justus C Of E School Objections: NO

Description of Development:

Permanent Placement of 3 steel containers

Proposal

The application site is the new Secondary School – Bishop Justus located within the Green Belt accessed off Magpie Hall Lane.

The site is bound by Magpie Hall Lane to the north, Bromley Common (A21) to the west, Princes Plain to the south and the Bromley Public Golf Course to the east. The closest residential neighbours relevant to the proposal are located on the north side of Magpie Hall Lane.

The proposal is to place three storage sheds within the site for the purposes of storing outdoor sporting equipment and outdoor gardening and grounds maintenance equipment.

One container will be located on the northern boundary of the school adjacent to Magpie Hall Lane, the other two containers will be located within the site east of the proposed all weather sports pitch and within the pond system associated with the sustainable site drainage system on site.

The storage containers will consist of steel containers clad in cedar boarding, and will have a 15° mono pitch roof covered in a sedum pre-sown blanket. The steel containers are desired for security purposes, whilst the cladding and roofing arrangements have been designed to match the other school buildings and to given an appearance of a garden shed.

The sheds will each have a maximum height of 3.0m, be 6m long and 2.2m wide.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers have been notified of the application and to date there have been no representations received.

Planning Considerations

The site is within the Green Belt.
The new school and associated community facilities were granted outline planning permission on appeal (refs. 01/02282 and APP/G5180/A/02/1089421). Most subsequent conditions and details have been granted permission under various planning references.

The proposal requires consideration of Policies BE1, G1 and of the UDP.

Policy BE1 (Design of New Development) requires that any new development be of a high standard, design and layout in order to create an attractive townscape and pleasant living and working conditions.

Policy G1 (Green Belt) states that new development within the green belt will be resisted unless for specified purposes including outdoor recreational activities. Very special circumstances will be required in other instances.

Conclusions

The main issue in this case is whether the proposed sheds would have an adverse impact on the visual amenities of the Green Belt.

The sheds will store equipment for outdoor recreation activities and outdoor grounds maintenance, and as such are considered to be suitable buildings within the green belt.

The proposed storage shed on the northern boundary will be the most noticeable of the three sheds to residential neighbours, and also the most conspicuous within the green belt. The northern boundary of the site does benefit from established vegetation forming a visual screen for the shed, however it is considered that more planting will be beneficial in mitigating the visual effects on the area, and the green belt characteristics. This can be required by way of condition should planning permission be granted.

The other two sheds are proposed to be located well within the site and unlikely to be visible from outside the site.

The proposed cladding and roofing materials for the sheds will match existing school buildings and given the design will look for all intents and purposes like garden sheds.

Having regard to the relevant policies in the UDP, it is considered that the proposed sheds, given their modest size, design and materials, will not have an adverse effect on the character or setting of the Green Belt, nor would they result in any significant harm to local visual amenities in general.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01780, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1  ACA01  Commencement of development 3 years
    ACA01R  A01 Reason 3 years
2  ACA04  Landscaping Scheme - full app no details
    ACA04R  Reason A04
3  AJ02B  Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps
4. Application No: 07/01812/FULL1 Ward: Cray Valley East

Address: Manor Oak Primary School Sweeps Lane Orpington Kent Conservation Area: NO

OS Grid Ref: E: 547926 N: 167914

Applicant: Manor Oak Primary School Objections: NO

Description of Development:

Single storey detached building for new children's centre which includes parent training room with associated creche, consulting rooms, office, plus four new car parking spaces

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey detached building at Manor Oak Primary School for the purposes of providing a new ‘Children’s Centre’ as required by the Government’s ‘Sure Start’ programme. The Children’s Centre will provide the following services to local parents:

- training courses for up to 15 parents at one time;
- crèche service for a maximum of 12 children offered to parents attending the training courses only;
- reception / information desk offering a drop in service for local parents wanting general parenting information; and
- office space for up to six visiting staff where ‘hot desks’ will be available for temporary use during normal business hours.

The School has been chosen as the best site to serve the local parents of the adjacent Sandway Park housing estate, and the large travelling community using the School. The need to have the Sure Start Children's Centre within easy access to these ‘higher need’ families is paramount in ensuring the success of the initiative.

Four new car parking spaces will also be created in the existing car parking area on the east side of the school buildings. However, given the principal concept of the Sure Start...
Children’s Centre is to serve the local community, it is envisaged that the majority of users will travel to the centre on foot.

The building has a proposed floor area of 260 square metres, and will be located on the northern boundary of the School site near to neighbouring residential dwellings at nos 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 Sweeps Lane.

The single storey building will have a flat roof, with a sedum grass roofing system, and will be clad in red facing brick and white render to match existing school buildings on site.

A buggy store is proposed to be located north of the front entrance that will have a beige coloured canopy.

A new path will be created in the north west corner of the school site to provide separate foot access to the Children’s Centre from Sweeps Lane. A 1.2m high palisade fence will be erected along this path, and a secure gate erected at the entrance.

The Children’s Centre proposed to be located at Manor Oak Primary School will be operated in conjunction with the Children’s Centre proposed for St Mary Cray Pavilion (ref. 07/01481).

Consultations

To date there have been no comments received from adjoining neighbours or local residents.

At the time of writing the report Highways comments had not been received, however should comments be received they will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Planning Considerations

The Manor Oak Primary School site is located within the Green Belt.

The proposal requires consideration of Policies BE1, G1, T3, C7 and C1 of the UDP.

Policy BE1 (Design of New Development) requires that any new development be of a high standard of design and layout in order to create an attractive townscape and pleasant living and working conditions.

G1 (Green Belt) states that new buildings within the green belt will be resisted unless for specified purposes. Very special circumstances will be required in other instances.

T3 (Parking) requires off-street parking associated with new developments to meet the standards set out in Appendix II of the UDP.

C1 (Community Facilities) supports development to meet an identified community need provided that the site is accessible by modes of transport other than car.

C7 (Education and Pre-School Facilities) supports new pre-school facilities provided they are located so as to maximise access by means of transport other than the car.
The appearance of the proposed building is in keeping with the characteristics of existing school buildings on site.

Mature vegetation grows along the north boundary of the school site, and visually separates the proposed new building from Sweeps Lane.

Conclusions

The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would be harmful to the visual amenities of the Green Belt, and if so whether there are any very special circumstances to justify the development.

The proposed Children’s Centre is a part of a new National Government initiative called ‘Sure Start Children’s Centres’, and is intended to be a support mechanism for local families in more socially deprived areas. The centres are required by Government to be located in areas identified as needing extra support. The Cray Valley East Community has been identified as needing this extra parenting support. As mentioned above, the Manor Oak Primary School site is considered to be the best regarding proximity to the target families at Sandway Park housing estate and the travelling community. It is considered that the Sure Start Children’s Centre demonstrates the ‘very special circumstances’ required of the proposal to outweigh the adverse effects of constructing a new building within the Green Belt.

The proposed new building will be located on the edge of the existing built environment that bounds the Green Belt land. Given the relatively small scale of the proposed new building, its location and the existing vegetative screening it is considered that the building will have minimal adverse effects on the Green Belt. It is recommended that a condition requiring landscaping be imposed should permission be granted as a further means of minimising the visual effect of the new building on the semi-rural characteristics of the Green Belt in this location.

Having regard to the relevant policies in the UDP, it is considered that the proposed single storey building will not have an adverse effect on the semi-rural character of the Green Belt, nor would it result in any significant harm to local visual and residential amenity in general.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01812, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1 ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2 ACA04 Landscaping Scheme - full app no details

Reason: In order to comply with Policies BE1 and G1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development.

3 Details of the storage facilities for buggies shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved details before the extension is first used.
Reason: In order to provide adequate facilities for the purposes of the building to accord with Policy C1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4 AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
G1 Green Belt
C7 Educational and pre-school facilities
C1 Community facilities
T3 Parking

INFORMATIVE(S)

1 You should seek engineering advice from the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre regarding the reinstatement of any damage to the highway. Please contact Dave Thomas of Street Services on 020 8313 4578.

2 Please be aware that permission/approval/consent may be required for any other proposals associated with this application (e.g. signage for the Children's Centre).
SECTION ‘2’ - Applications meriting special consideration

5. Application No: 07/00516/TPO Ward: Biggin Hill
Address: 8 Filey Close Biggin Hill Westerham Kent TN16 3PE
Conservation Area: NO
OS Grid Ref: E: 540786 N: 157793
Applicant: Mrs Wicks
Objections: NO

Description of Development:

Fell one beech tree in back garden
SUBJECT TO TPO 70

Proposal

The applicant is seeking to fell a mature protected beech tree which is growing at the end of the back garden. Applications were made to fell the tree in 1987, 1995, 2000 and 2004. All were refused consent and an appeal in 1996 was dismissed.

Consultations

Adjoining owners have supported the proposed felling.

Planning Considerations

The applicant is concerned about the size of the tree and its impact on the house and garden, in respect of the volume of debris produced by the tree, leaves, seeds and dead wood. They are also concerned about the likely damage to the property if part or all of the tree were to fail.

Applications to fell the tree were made in 1987, 1995, 2000 and 2004. All were refused and an appeal in 1996 was also dismissed.

The tree is over 20 metres in height and is a reasonably healthy condition. It is of good form and is a prominent local feature. 8 Filey Close is the centre house of a terrace of three two storey houses built in the 1970s. The back garden is about 15 metres long and faces west. The tree is at the end of the garden which slopes up from the house towards the tree. The reasons given for wanting the tree felled are common complaints about mature trees in back gardens and debris falling from the tree is normal garden maintenance in this Borough. In respect of the tree falling in a storm, no guarantee can
be given that the tree would never fail but there are no signs that there is an imminent risk of failure.

The applicant is concerned about the additional costs and effort of maintenance associated with the retention of the beech tree. However these matters are not normally considered to be sufficient to outweigh the merits of a significant protected tree.

**Conclusions**

The applicant is concerned about the impact of the tree on the property. However the beech tree is a significant local feature and the issues raised are not normally considered to be sufficient to outweigh the merits of a significant protected tree.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/00516, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED**

The reasons for refusal are:

1. The beech tree is considered to make an important contribution to the visual amenities of the area and the loss would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.

---

6. Application No: 07/00726/FULL1 Ward: Orpington
Address: 345 Court Road Orpington Kent BR6 9BZ Conservation Area: NO
OS Grid Ref: E: 547146 N: 164935
Applicant: Bolton Estates Limited Objections: YES

Description of Development:

Erection of 2 detached two storey five bedroom dwellings with attached double garages at land adjacent to 345 Court Road and creation of new vehicular access to serve the existing and proposed dwellings

Proposal

The application site is just under 0.23 hectares in size and permission is sought for a scheme comprising the erection of 2 detached two storey five bedroom dwellings with
attached double garage on land adjacent to 345 Court Road. A new vehicular access is proposed to serve the existing and proposed dwellings, which would be created towards the centre of the plot. The existing vehicular access to No. 345 Court Road would be ‘stopped up’.

The proposed dwellings would be of two storey scale, there would also be habitable accommodation above the double garages within the roof space. The overall height of the buildings would be approx. 8.45m, with the garages approx. 5.7m in height.

The rear garden depth of the proposed dwellings (as scaled from the plans) varies between plots, namely plot 1 (adjacent to No.345): 13m-17.5m and plot 2: 8m – 13.5m (the majority of the garden area to this property would be provided at the side).

Screening plants have been proposed along the front boundary of the development to provide a buffer to Court Road. The back to back distance of the proposed dwellings and the existing dwellings on Goddington Lane would exceed 25m.

The area generally is residential in character although Court Road itself is busy road and part of the Strategic Road Network for London. The existing property at 345 Court Road is a bungalow and the site backs onto rear gardens of residential properties fronting Goddington Lane.

The above proposals represent an amendment to scheme previously allowed on appeal.

Consultations

There have been several letters of objection received from residents along Goddington Lane with respect to the principle of the proposed development. The main issues raised in those letters are as follows:

- concern about access onto Court Road, as this is a dangerous stretch of road
- concern about the impact on the amenities of dwellings in Goddington Lane in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy
- concern about sightlines for safe entry and exit from the property
- concern about drainage/surface water etc
- concern that the chalet style houses are still two storey and height of the new houses would be out of character in an area characterised by bungalows
- concern that the dwellings would dominate the skyline from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties

No objections are raised to the principle of the development with regard to parking and the creation of a new access from a highways point of, subject to conditions.

Highways drainage advise that there is no public surface water sewer near to the site and surface water would need to be drained to soakaways.

Transport for London has also been consulted on the proposals however, at the time of writing this report comments had not been received and will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Planning Considerations
The relevant policies relating to this application include BE1 – Design of New Development, H7 - Housing Design, T15 - New Accesses and T22 - Road Safety of the Unitary Development Plan.

With regard to the recent planning history, a similar application for 2 two storey, five bedroom houses with attached garage and creation of new vehicular access to serve the existing and proposed dwellings was refused under ref. 06/01015 on the following ground:

The proposal will constitute an overdevelopment of the site, out of character and scale with surrounding development, thereby contrary to Policies E.1 and H.2 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policies BE1 and H6 of the second deposit draft Unitary Development Plan (September 2002) and Policies 4B.1 and 4B.7 of the London Plan.

A subsequent appeal was allowed earlier this year. The Inspector considered the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and did not consider the proposal to amount to an overdevelopment of the site. In concluding the following comments were made:

“... The appellants state, and the Council do not dispute, that the site area is some 0.23 hectares. The density of the proposal would thus be approx. 9 dwellings per hectare. This is significantly lower than the minimum figure of 30 dwellings per hectare recommended on government guidance and, as both proposed dwellings would be provided, in my view, with adequately sized gardens, the proposals would not amount to an overdevelopment…The submitted drawings indicate that the separation distance between the proposed dwellings and those existing in Goddington Lane would be a minimum of 34m. At this distance I do not consider the degree of mutual overlooking between the rear windows of opposing dwellings would be unacceptable.”

With regards to the impact upon highways safety the following comments were made:

“The access would be modified in response to earlier comments from the highway authority and would be provided with visibility splays in accordance with current standards and the amount of traffic using it would be low. I do not consider therefore that the proposal would adversely affect highway safety.”

Under planning ref. 06/03712 planning permission was refused [prior to the appeal for ref. 06/01015 being allowed] for a very similar proposal to the current application on the grounds of overdevelopment and loss of street trees.

Conclusions

This application is a resubmission following the previous proposal (ref. 06/01015) being allowed on appeal. The requirement for a further application has come about due to a reduction in the amount of land within the applicant’s ownership. This reduction amounts to a (approx.) 8.5m reduction in the width of that part of the site closest to 345 Court Road.

The findings of the Inspector in considering the previous application are relevant as the current proposal is not dissimilar in terms of the nature and scale of development proposed. The Inspector established that the proposal would not unduly impact upon the amenity of residents of Goddington Lane, nor did he consider the proposal to represent an overdevelopment of the site or impact upon highway safety.
The main differences between the scheme allowed on appeal and the current proposal are:

- reduction in the width of the site resulting in both units being moved further away from No. 345 and reductions in the depths of rear gardens, minimum 8m depth of rear garden of unit 2 retained, minimum depth of rear garden to unit 1 reduced from c.15 m to 13m.
- removal of the rear dormer to unit 2
- unit 2 stepped forward by 1m

The current proposal represents the same scale of development on a slightly smaller site. In view of the Inspectors comments regarding the density of the previous scheme which he considered to be to be significantly lower than recommended in government guidance, Members may consider that the proposal to be acceptable.

In allowing the previous appeal the inspector did not consider a condition restricting permitted development rights to be necessary however in view of the reduction in the size of the site, if Members are minded to grant permission it may be considered necessary in this instance.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 89/00961, 94/02377, 00/00067, 04/00789, 04/04320, 06/00521, 06/01015, 06/03712 and 07/00726, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: MEMBERS' VIEWS ARE REQUESTED**

0 D00002 If Members are minded to grant planning permission the following conditions are suggested:

1 ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years

2 ACA04 Landscaping Scheme - full app no details
   ACA04R Reason A04

3 ACC01 Satisfactory materials
   ACC01R C01 Reason C01

4 ACA07 Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted
   ACA07R A07 Reason A07

5 ACH03 Satisfactory parking - full application
   ACH03R H03 Reason H03

6 ACH16 Hardstanding for wash-down facilities
   ACH16R H16 Reason H16

7 ACH18 Refuse storage - no details submitted
   ACH18R H18 Reason H18

8 ACH24 Stopping up of access
   ACH24R H24 Reason H24

9 ACI02 Rest of "pd" Rights - Class A, B,C and E
   ACI02R I02 Reason I02

**Reason:** In order for the Council to control future extensions/alterations in the interests of the amenities of the area and in accordance with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

10 ACI08 Private vehicles
   ACI08R I08 Reason I08

11 ACI15 Protection from traffic noise (1 insert)
   ACI15R I15 Reason I15
While the development hereby permitted is being carried out, provision shall be made to accommodate operatives' and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority and such provision shall remain available for such uses to the Authority's satisfaction throughout the course of the development.

Prior to first occupation of the units hereby permitted the developer shall submit written certification to the Local Planning Authority that the access road has been lit in accordance with BS 5489 - 1:2003 and that such lighting will be maintained to such standard thereafter.

Prior to the commencement of development details of a scheme to close the existing vehicular access to No. 345 Court Road, create a new single vehicular access to serve that property and the development site and alter the existing/provide new footway/concrete post and rail fencing in Court Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority and these access/footway/fencing arrangements shall be completed before any of the new dwellings is first occupied and maintained as such thereafter.

If Members are minded to refuse planning permission the following grounds are suggested:

1. The proposal will constitute an overdevelopment of the site, out of character and scale with surrounding development, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policies 4B.1 and 4B.7 of The London Plan.
Description of Development:

Extension of split level bungalow, with alterations to the roof, front and rear dormers rear Juliet balcony and single storey rear extension

Proposal

The application proposes the extension of this split level bungalow to form a detached 3 storey five bedroom house with front and rear dormers, rear juliet balcony and extension to existing cellar area.

This is detached bungalow from the front elevation and a two storey from the rear. The neighbouring properties are both two storey. The land here slopes away steeply in the rear.

Consultations

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

- the increase in roof height will overshadow neighbouring garden to north as their garden is lower.
- the bulk of the development is dominant and not in keeping with the street scene.
- loss of sunlight/daylight/privacy/outlook.
- development will overshadow rear garden to the north.
- side dormer window will be at the same height and look into neighbouring bathroom window.
- rear dormer and balcony will overlook the neighbouring garden to the north.
- the front and rear extensions will disrupt the building line of the road.
- the rear extension would dominate the rear garden
- the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site
- neighbouring property to south have no objections, however would like hours of constructions to be limited.
- the property was built as a bungalow in the 50’s and not a house, therefore there must be a reason for this.

No objections have been received from highways, Thames Water, drainage or trees, but standard conditions for drainage and trees are requested.

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

Policy BE1, Design of New Development, states that all proposals should be of a high standard of design and layout, and should be attractive, complement the scale, form, layout and materials of the adjacent buildings and respect the existing street scene.

Policies H8, Residential Extensions, states that the design and layout of proposals should respect the host dwelling, compatible with development in the surrounding area and space between buildings should be respected or maintained when these contribute to the character of the area.

H9, Side Space, states that a proposal of two or more storeys in height will have a minimum of a 1 metre space from the side boundary of the site and should be retained for the full height and lengths for the flank wall of the building, however where higher standards of separation already exist, proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character and appearance of the host building, the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the surrounding properties.

The history of this property shows that permission was granted for the construction of a bungalow in 1949 and no condition was made for its retention as a bungalow.

This application will increase the roof height of the existing dwelling and create additional living area in the loft space by the addition of front and rear dormers and single storey rear extension. The front porch will be extended upwards to create a feature at the front of the property, but it will not project any further forward than the existing line. The drawings now submitted are the 3rd revision, they have removed the front garage, reduced the rear extension by over 3 metres and reduced the height of the roof to create an almost flat roof design. The bulk on the rear has been reduced since the original design by putting rear dormers in, the bulk has been reduced by almost 1m and the height by 0.5m. These alterations are intended to overcome any objections raised by the neighbouring occupiers and an obscure glazed window condition could be placed on the bathroom window facing the side elevation of No. 2 Hollydale Drive.

Concern has also be raised by the neighbouring property to the north No. 250 Hastings Road, regarding the alterations to roof height and the possible overshadowing this may have on their property. The roof height will increase by approximately 3.2 metres, however the angle of the roof remains the same as the existing roof line to minimise the impact this may have.

No. 250 Hastings Road is situated to the north of the above property and on the corner of Hastings Road and Hollydale Drive. No. 250 Hastings Road is set further forward than 1 Hollydale Drive, due to this positioning approximately half of the garden is adjacent to the side of the above property.

The application property is situated on a steep gradient, the front of the property has the appearance of a bungalow, however from the rear it is a two storey house. The garden at
the adjacent property No. 250 Hastings Road is lower than the above property, but the house is higher creating potential problems with further overshadowing.

Concerns over the rearward projection of the single storey rear element and further overshadowing of their garden have been expressed. However, the rear extension is set to the southern side of the property adjacent to No. 2 Hollydale Drive approximately, 7.8 metres from the boundary with No. 250 Hastings Road and due to the siting of the two properties between 21 and 17.4 metres from the rear elevation of No. 250 Hastings Road. Therefore because the single storey rear element is set away from the neighbouring property to the north, overshadowing from this element should not be a significant problem.

Given this it is considered that the siting, size and design of the proposed extensions would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area.

Members may agree that this proposal as submitted is acceptable.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01034, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 18.04.2007 14.05.2007 21.05.2007

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2. ACB01 Trees to be retained during building op.
   ACB01R Reason B01
3. ACB02 Trees - protective fencing
   ACB02R Reason B02
4. ACB03 Trees - no bonfires
   ACB03R Reason B03
5. ACB04 Trees - no trenches, pipelines or drains
   ACB04R Reason B04
6. ACB16 Trees - no excavation
   ACB16R Reason B16
7. ACC04 Matching materials
   ACC04R Reason C04
8. ACD03 Restricted 100mm outlet
   ACD03R Reason D03
9. ACI12 Obscure glazing (1 insert) on the southern elevation
   Reason: In order to comply with Policies BE1 and H8 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties
10. AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential extensions
H9 Side Space
Description of Development:

Front boundary wall/piers/railings and vehicular access gates to a maximum height of 1.7m (Part Retrospective)

Proposal

The application proposes a front boundary wall/piers/railings and vehicular access gates to a maximum height of 1.7 metres (part retrospective).

The front boundary wall and brick piers have already been constructed at the application site, however the proposed railings and vehicular access gates are not as yet in place. The site slopes downwards from north to south therefore at the northern end of the site the height of the brick wall is approximately 0.83 metres and at the southern end it increases to approximately 0.91 metres. The height of the brick piers similarly increases from approximately 1.4 metres at the northern end of the site to approximately 1.65 metres at the southern end.

There is a similar part retrospective application for the front boundary wall and brick piers to the north of the application site at No.61, however technical advice is still awaited and therefore this development will be considered separately.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers have been notified of the application and no representations have been received to date.

In terms of highways issues, there are concerns about this proposal due to the fact that Elmstead Lane has a relatively high pedestrian flow because of the nearby train station. A standard condition requesting a visibility splay would normally be sought for an application like this, however the neighbouring properties, Nos. 59 and 61a (both to the south of the application site), do not appear to have the relevant splays. If a visibility splay was required at the application site, then the work on site would have to be modified.

Planning Considerations
The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies BE1, BE7, T6 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Policy BE1 (Design of New Development) requires a high standard of design in new development generally and seeks to protect the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Policy BE7 (Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure) seeks to resist the construction of enclosures that would erode the open nature of an area or adversely impact local townscape character.

Policy T6 (Pedestrians) relates to pedestrians and seeks to consider the impact of proposal on their movement.

Policy T18 (Road Safety) seeks to ensure that road safety is not adversely affected by a proposal.

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that the proposal would have on the visual amenities of the street scene and character of the area, and the impact that the proposed development would have on vehicular and pedestrian safety.

Conclusions

A front boundary wall and railings to a maximum height of two metres was permitted at No.59 in July 2003 under ref. 03/02069. Condition H11 regarding visibility splays for new buildings was attached to this planning permission, but according to the Highways Division, this does not appear to have been complied with. A set of railings in excess of one metre has also been erected at No.61a, however there is no history related to this development. The railings at No. 61a, together with the hedge (which can be seen in the photographs provided) both mean that the visibility splays at this site are limited. It should be noted, however, that if both of these boundary enclosures have been in place for more than four years then enforcement action cannot be taken.

A number of other front boundary walls and railings can be seen along Elmstead Lane, therefore it is considered that the proposal is not out of character in the area and would not significantly impact the appearance of the street scene. The question of the potential impact on vehicular and pedestrian safety is therefore the principal issue at hand and Members need to consider whether it would be appropriate to defer consideration of this application to seek the applicant’s confirmation that the works will be modified to comply with highways requirements. If this is agreed, the modifications can be the subject of a condition. At the same time, it would be appropriate to investigate the other examples mentioned to ascertain whether there has been any breach of planning control. If, alternatively, Members are minded to permit the application without modification, the following conditions are suggested.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01182, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: MEMBERS' VIEWS ARE REQUESTED

0 D00002 If Members are minded to grant planning permission the following conditions are suggested:
1 ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2 ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan
Reason: In the interest of the visual amenities of the area.
3 AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
BE7 Railings, boundary walls and other means of enclosure
T6 Pedestrians
T18 Road safety

D00003 If Members are minded to refuse planning permission the following grounds are suggested:

1. The proposal, by reason of its design, would be prejudicial to the general conditions of safety along Elmstead Lane and as such would be contrary to Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Further recommendation:

Enforcement action be authorised to reduce the height of the front boundary wall and brick piers to a height not exceeding the 'permitted development' entitlement.

9. Application No: 07/01303/FULL1 Ward: Clock House
Address: 97 Avenue Road Beckenham Kent BR3 4RX Conservation Area: NO
OS Grid Ref: E: 535696 N: 169505
Applicant: Mr R Bartlett Objections: YES

Description of Development:

Elevational alterations/ 2m high front gates and change of use of offices and workshop (Class B1) to 1 one bedroom flat and 1 two bedroom house

Proposal

The application site is located on the north east side of Avenue Road. The site is rectangular with a width of 7m and a depth of 31m. The site is currently occupied by an end of terrace building used as offices with a workshop building towards the rear of the
site. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and terraced properties, with uses in the area a mix of retail, office and residential.

It is proposed to change the use of the main building and rear building to form 1 one bedroom flat and 1 two bedroom flat, with replacement front gates and elevational alterations. The existing 2 parking spaces at the front will be retained.

Elevational alterations include additional first floor windows, rooflights on both roof slopes and two means of escape flank doors. The side walkway will remain covered and will serve as an entrance to the rear two bedroom flat.

**Consultations**

Representations received from neighbouring properties are summarised as follows:

- overlooking into the gardens and houses of neighbouring properties
- increase in parking in the area.

No additional car parking spaces are proposed. Highways have expressed no objections to the proposal, subject to conditions.

There are no technical drainage objections to the proposal.

Environmental Health has expressed concern regarding the means of escape. No objections are raised in relation to light and ventilation.

Building Control has expressed concerns regarding the means of escape opening onto a common access way. This can be conditioned to request sash style escape windows.

**Planning Considerations**

The proposal should be considered principally with regard to BE1, H12 and T18 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (2006). These concern the design of new development, as well as issues of highway safety and conversion of non-residential buildings to residential use.

A previous scheme for conversion into two flats was refused under ref. 06/03818 on the following grounds:

*The proposed conversion constitutes an unsatisfactory use of the property, lacking in adequate natural light and ventilation for future occupants, contrary to Policy H11 of the Unitary Development Plan.*

The current scheme proposes additional rooflights to the ground floor flat, with two ground floor means of escape doors to the flank elevation in an attempt to address the previous Environmental Health concerns. The current scheme also omits the previously proposed courtyard amenity space.

The main issue of concern in this instance is the suitability for this business premises to be converted to a non-business use, along with the standard of accommodation provided for future occupants. The impact on highway safety and neighbouring residential amenities must also be assessed.
Conclusions

Although no evidence has been submitted to support the view that the property is unlikely to be sold as a commercial premises, there are several examples of similar conversions on Avenue Road, such as Nos. 84, 87 and 91.

With regard to impact on the amenities of the adjacent properties it is considered that issues of overlooking can be controlled with an obscure glazing condition and there are no highways concerns regarding parking on Avenue Road. Given the character of the area is predominantly residential, the conversion of the building into two residential units is considered acceptable without detrimental harm to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent properties.

The proposed means of escape are in the form of two side escapes onto the common access way adjacent to No. 99. This is not acceptable in its present form but can be conditioned to ensure details of these windows are agreed by the Council.

There is provision for off-street parking for approximately two cars on the forecourt to the front of the building and this arrangement is common amongst other properties along the road. As such, no technical objections are raised to the proposal.

In summary the principle of conversion is considered acceptable however there is concern regarding lack of amenity and over-intensive use. Members will need to consider whether the proposed use provides an adequate standard of accommodation for future occupants.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 06/03818 and 07/01303, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: MEMBERS VIEWS ARE REQUESTED**

0 D00002 If Members are minded to grant planning permission the following conditions are suggested:
1 ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2 ACC04 Matching materials
   ACC04R Reason C04
3 ACH02 Satisfactory parking - no details submit
   ACH02R Reason H02
4 ACH12 Vis. splays (vehicular access) (2 in) 3.3 x 2.4 x 3.3 1m
   ACH12R Reason H12
5 ACI12 Obscure glazing (1 insert) in the first floor elevations
   ACI12R I12 reason (1 insert) BE1
6 Details of the proposed means of escape windows on the southern flank elevation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority. The windows shall be installed and permanently maintained in accordance with the approved details.
   **Reason:** In order to comply with Policies BE1 and H12 of the Unitary Development Plan.
7 AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)

BE1 Design of New Development
If Members are minded to refuse planning permission the following grounds are suggested:

1. The proposed conversion represents an unsatisfactory and overintensive use of the property, lacking in adequate amenity for future occupants, contrary to Policy H12 of the Unitary Development Plan.

10. Application No: 07/01342/FULL6 Ward: Chislehurst

Address: Bredon House 10 The Meadow
          Chislehurst Kent BR7 6AA

Conservation Area: Chislehurst

OS Grid Ref: E: 544195 N: 170814

Applicant: Mr And Mrs K Little

Objections: YES

Description of Development:

First floor rear extension AMENDMENT TO APPROVED APPLICATION REF. 06/03594. PART ONE/TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Proposal

The application site is a 2-storey, detached dwelling situated on the east side of The Meadow within the Chislehurst Conservation Area. The road is fronted by similar type houses of various designs on similar sized plots and built to a regular building line.

The proposal comprises a first floor rear extension, and follows on from a previous application whereby planning permission was granted at Plans Sub Committee for a part one/two storey rear extension. The current application has been submitted as an amendment to the previous planning application.

The amendment is to increase the width of the first floor by approximately 1.3 metres in order to bring it in line with the southern flank wall of the dwellinghouse.

Consultations

Objections received from residents of The Meadow may be summarised as follows:
- wish to point out that the original application was refused by the Council and at Appeal;
- this current application is in direct contravention to the decision made by both the Council and Appeal Inspector;
- the proposal will create an oppressive environment along the side of number 8;
- proposal is incompatible with the spatial standards of the conservation area;
- the proposed alterations will adversely affect the privacy and amenities currently enjoyed by the occupants of both neighbouring properties;
- a reduction in width was done in an attempt to combat original refusal grounds, if this application is granted it will allow the original reasons for rejection.

Another local resident supports the application on the following grounds:

- the proposal will simplify the appearance of the rear elevation and remove the unsightly small flat roofed are in the south east corner of the property;
- the additional floor area of 3.84 sq. m is minimal and will have no adverse affect upon adjoining properties;
- it cannot be seen from number 12 The Meadow;
- number 8 have no windows overlooking this area.

There have been no objections from the Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas.

No objections have been raised from the conservation aspect.

**Planning Considerations**

The proposal falls to be considered with regard to policies BE1, BE11, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Policy BE1 requires a high standard of design in new development generally, and seeks to protect the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Policy BE11 draws attention to the need to preserve and enhance conservation areas and highlights the need for all proposals for new development to ensure the character and appearance of the conservation area is maintained.

Policy H8 aims to ensure that residential extensions respect the scale, form and spatial standards of the surrounding area, and protect the privacy and amenities of adjoining properties.

Policy H9 draws attention to the need to respect the spatial standards of the surrounding area and retain satisfactory standards between existing properties.

As regards to history, a part one-two storey rear extension was REFUSED under reference 05/02104 on the following ground:

- by reason of its excessive rearward projections the proposal would have a seriously detrimental effect on the daylighting to the adjoining house and the prospect which the occupants of that dwelling might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy.

A subsequent appeal was dismissed.
A further application, reference 06/03594 for a part one/two storey rear extension was PERMITTED in 2006.

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. It is also essential to compare the current application with the previous cases in order to assess whether the changes result in unacceptable development.

The original application was refused and the consequent Appeal was dismissed. Permission was subsequently granted after overcoming the original refusal grounds by reducing the depth of the proposal by approximately 0.6 metres, from approximately 3.8 metres in the original application to approximately 3.2 metres. The height of the pitched roof and the width of the proposed first floor rear extension were also reduced.

The ground floor aspect of the current proposal does not differ at all from the proposal which was granted permission under reference DC/06/03594. The only difference with the current proposal is at first floor level and this involves extending the first floor in width towards the southern property boundary by approximately 1.3 metres. The depth of the proposed first floor rear extension within this application is approximately 3.2 metres which is the same as the depth that has already been granted permission under application reference 06/03594.

The height of the proposed extension when combined with the previously permitted application will measure approximately 6.9 metres which will include a pitched roof, and this does not differ from the application that was granted permission under reference 06/03594.

The current application does not alter anything from the previous application along the northern side of the applicant’s property, between No 12 (Spring Cottage) and No 10 (Bredon House, the applicants), and therefore the current proposal does not affect the residents of Number 12 The Meadow at all.

There are no windows proposed in the southern flank of the extension and the window position in the rear elevation has not changed from that previously permitted. It would be difficult to argue, therefore, that the current proposal would increase overlooking to number 8 The Meadow.

If planning permission is granted, it may be advisable to inform the Applicants that any future applications for development may not be looked upon favourably due to the scale of the development that has already been granted on this site.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 05/02104, 06/0028/S78 and 06/03594, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:
11. Application No: 07/01393/FULL6  Ward: West Wickham

Address: 54 Barnfield Wood Road Beckenham Kent BR3 6SU  Conservation Area: NO

OS Grid Ref: E: 538948 N: 167573

Applicant: Mr M Denton  Objections: NO

Description of Development:

Two storey side extension with front porch canopy

Proposal

The application site comprises a two storey semi-detached house. The property resides with a mixture of large, fairly uniformly designed, semi-detached and detached properties within the Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character.

The proposal is for a two storey side extension with a pitched roof to the south western flank of the property which will provide a new garage and WC and additional kitchen area. At first floor level an additional bedroom and bathroom will be created. The extension measures approximately 2.4 metres wide and extends the whole length of the house at ground and first floor levels (not including the bay windows). There is a 1 metre side space proposed between the flank wall of the extension and the flank boundary of the property.

There is also a front porch canopy proposed at the front of the house.
Originally, the roof of the extension was proposed to be at the same height as the existing ridgeline. However, further to case officer correspondence, the applicants submitted revised plans showing a reduction in height of the proposed ridgeline. The applicants were also advised during the course of the application that the first floor part of the extension should be set back from the front building line of the original dwelling. However, the application did not wish to amend this aspect of the scheme.

**Consultations**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and no representations were received.

**Planning Considerations**

Policies BE1, H8, H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan apply to the development and should be given due consideration. These policies seek to ensure a satisfactory standard of design and safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties, the spatial characteristics of the area and the visual amenities of the area. Applications for development in an Area of Special Residential Character will be required to respect and complement the established and individual quality of the area. The Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character has the character of a garden estate given by the quality of the and appearance of the hedges, walls, fences, and front gardens. Houses here reside on generous plots and the area has maintained its character and unity intact.

**Conclusions**

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

A first floor side extension set back from the front of the property was permitted at No. 52 Barnfield Wood Road, the adjoining semi-detached property, under ref. 86/02892. This was before the ASRC was designated. The two storey side extension here proposed is of a similar width to the side extension at No. 52 and is now subservient to the main ridge line. In addition the proposed front porch canopy is of a similar size and design to that of next door. As a result the proposed extension now mirrors more closely the two storey side extension at No. 52, although it is not set back.

It is therefore considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in design terms although Members will need to consider whether the reduction in spatial standards is acceptable in this ASRC.

If the committee is satisfied with the proposal, the following is recommended:

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01393, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 11.06.2007

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

Subject to the following conditions:
12. Application No: 07/01464/FULL1

Ward: Bickley

Address: 17 Bickley Road Bromley BR1 2ND

Conservation Area: NO

OS Grid Ref: E: 542068  N: 169042

Applicant: Mr R Houldsworth

Objections: YES

Description of Development:

Three bedroom detached house with detached single garage on land to the rear of 17 Bickley Road

Proposal

This site forms part of the rear garden of No.17, which is a large detached Grade II Statutorily Listed dwelling located on the south-western side of Bickley Road. An access road currently runs between Nos.17 and 19 Bickley Road, which previously served garages to the rear of No.19. The adjacent dwelling at No.19 is also Statutorily Listed and has recently been divided into 4 flats.

It is proposed to erect a two storey detached three bedroom dwelling with detached garage on land at the rear of No.17, with access gained via the existing access road.
between Nos.17 and 19. Planning permission was recently granted for a detached dwelling at the rear of No.19 accessed via this road.

The proposed dwelling would have a maximum height of 8.35m, and the first floor would be partially contained within the roof slope, with a catslide roof on the south-eastern side adjacent to the new dwelling at the rear of No.19. The detached garage would be located to the north-west of the dwelling, adjacent to No.15, and would have a pitched roof.

The triangular-shaped rear garden varies in depth between 5m and 22m, while a rear garden depth of 27m would be retained to the existing dwelling at No.17.

The submitted plans show the existing trees and shrubs along the tapering rear boundary with No.11 Heath Park Drive to be retained and enhanced.

This application is accompanied with a detailed Design and Access Statement.

**Consultations**

Several letters of objection have been received to the proposals from nearby residents, the main points of which are summarised as follows:

- the revised position of the house now looks directly into the rear of flats at No.19
- plot now includes some land taken from the garden of the plot at the rear of No.19
- increased noise and disturbance in a backland location and along the access road
- overdevelopment of the site
- increased pressure on public sewers
- building is overdominant in relation to the Listed Buildings.

Highways – No objections raised to the use of the existing access road to serve an additional dwelling, nor to the parking provision and layout.

Trees – No significant trees would be affected by the proposals.

Drainage – No objections raised.

Waste – Refuse must be placed at the start of the access road.

**Planning Considerations**

The proposal falls to be considered with regard to Policies H7, BE1, BE8, T3 and NE7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

Policy H7 requires the scale and form of new residential development to be in keeping with the surrounding area, and the privacy and amenities of adjoining occupiers to be adequately safeguarded.

Policy BE1 requires a high standard of design in new development generally, and seeks to protect the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

Policy BE8 seeks to ensure the preservation and conservation of historic buildings, and resist proposals on land adjacent to or within the curtilage of a Listed Building that would be detrimental to its setting.
Policy T3 seeks to ensure that an appropriate level of on-site car parking is provided to meet the needs of new residential developments.

Policy NE7 aims to protect important trees on a new development site.

Government guidance, and that contained within the London Plan, require Councils to maximise the best use of urban land where appropriate when considering new residential developments, while acknowledging that they should be sympathetic to the surrounding residential area.

The following is a summary of planning applications submitted which relate to the erection of a dwelling on land to the rear of No.19, which lies immediately adjacent to the current plot.

Outline permission was refused (ref. 03/02199) in 2003 for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling with detached double garage, access road and gates on land to the rear of No.19 on grounds relating to unacceptable backland development, overlooking of adjoining properties, and detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed Building. An appeal against this decision was dismissed in June 2004 due to the visually intrusive nature of the development, its backland setting which would be out of keeping with the established pattern of development in the area, its detrimental impact on the setting of the Listed Building, and increased noise and disturbance which would be brought further back into the site.

Permission was refused (ref. 05/02172) in 2005 for the erection of a detached two storey 3 bedroom house on the site (which also included some land to the rear of No.17) with a detached triple garage, boundary fencing, access drive and entrance gates, on grounds relating to unacceptable backland development. The triple garage was positioned on land at the rear of No.17, and Members were particularly concerned about its impact on adjacent dwellings in Heath Park Drive.

Permission was subsequently granted under ref. 05/03374, for the erection of a detached two storey 3 bedroom house on land at the rear of No.19 adjacent, with access between Nos.17 and 19, which included an area of land to the rear of No.17 on which a double garage was to be sited.

Permission was then granted under ref. 06/00091 for a slightly larger house on a smaller plot (which did not include the area of land at the rear of No.17), with the siting of the house and detached garage altered, and this scheme is currently under construction.

With regard to the current site to the rear of No.17, permission was refused in August 2006 under ref. 06/01831 for the erection of a two storey 3 bedroom dwelling with attached double garage on grounds relating to the detrimental impact on the amenities of No.11 Heath Park Drive, and on the character, appearance and setting of the Listed Building at No.17, along with unsatisfactory visual impact from neighbouring properties.

The subsequent appeal was dismissed in March 2007 wherein the Inspector considered that the proposed dwelling, by reason of its overall height and bulk, would appear cramped in its plot which is smaller than the plot containing a similar sized dwelling to the rear of No.19. Although he accepted that the subdivision of the rear garden of No.17 would not adversely affect the setting of the listed building, and that good separation would be retained to the dwelling at No.17, the proposed dwelling, by
reason of its height, bulk and proximity to the rear garden boundary with No.17, would compete with the listed building and thus detract from its setting. He did, however, consider the arts and crafts design to be acceptable in principle.

With regard to the impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties, the Inspector considered that the proposed dwelling would not be unduly dominant in the outlook from the rear of No.11 Heath Park Drive, but considered that the rear-facing window of the master bedroom would result in unacceptable overlooking of part of the rear garden of No.11. In relation to the impact of the use of the access road by an additional dwelling, the Inspector concluded that it would not create unacceptable disturbance to the occupiers of the flats at No.19.

Also relevant is a recently granted appeal for the erection of a three storey block of 12 flats at No.15 Bickley Road (ref. 04/04555).

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are the impact of the revised proposals on the amenities of nearby dwellings, on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings, and on the general character and spatial standards of the surrounding area.

The current scheme differs from the recently dismissed appeal in the following main ways:

- the roof ridge height has been reduced by approximately 0.2m and a lower catslide roof is now proposed on the south-eastern side of the dwelling closest to No.11 Heath Park Drive
- the attached double garage originally proposed to the front of the dwelling has been replaced with a single detached garage to the side of the dwelling, thus reducing the overall footprint and moving built development further away from No.17
- the dwelling has been reoriented to face further away from the rear of No.11 Heath Park Drive to prevent undue overlooking from rear bedroom windows, but results in the dwelling obliquely facing the rear of No.19
- the depth of the rear garden has increased.

The proposed dwelling is now set further back from the listed building at No.17, and the overall size and bulk of the building has been reduced, particularly in relation to the adjoining property at No.11 Heath Park Drive. However, Members will need to carefully consider whether this is sufficient to ensure that the new building does not compete with the listed building and thus detract from its setting.

In relation to the impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers, the reorientation of the proposed dwelling satisfactorily prevents undue overlooking of No.11 Heath Park Drive, and although it would now be turned slightly towards the rear elevation of No.19 Bickley Road, sufficient separation would be maintained in order to protect the amenities of the occupiers of this property.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 04/04555, 05/03374, 06/00091, 06/01831 and 07/01464, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: MEMBERS' VIEWS ARE REQUESTED
If Members are minded to grant planning permission the following conditions are suggested:

1. Commencement of development 3 years
2. Landscaping Scheme - full app no details
3. Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted
4. Satisfactory materials
5. Details of windows
6. Surface water drainage - no det. submitt
7. Satisfactory parking - full application
8. Turning area
9. Hardstanding for wash-down facilities
10. Rest of "pd" Rights - Class A, B, C and E
11. Obscure glazing (1 insert) at first floor level in the north-western flank elevation
12. No additional windows (2 inserts) flank dwelling
13. Secure By Design
14. Slab levels - no details submitted
15. While the development hereby permitted is being carried out, provision shall be made to accommodate operatives' and construction vehicles loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, and such provision shall remain available for such uses to the Authority's satisfaction throughout the course of the development.
16. Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

If Members are minded to refuse planning permission the following grounds are suggested:

1. The proposed dwelling, by reason of its size, height and bulk, would result in an overdominant building which would detract from the setting of the listed building, thereby contrary to Policies H7, BE1 and BE8 of the Unitary Development Plan.
Description of Development:

Outdoor swimming pool/terrace area, detached pool plant building and 2.1m high fencing

Proposal

The application site is to the south western side of Sidcup By Pass (A20). The site forms part of the Green Belt and Chislehurst Conservation Area. The application site comprises a two storey detached building for use as a health and fitness club, with a car park to the north of the site and 3 floodlit tennis courts to the south. Access to the site is via A20 Sidcup By Pass.

Planning permission is sought for an outdoor swimming pool between the existing tennis courts and the club building. The proposed swimming pool measures approximately 8m x 20m in size. The application also seeks permission for a terraced area surrounding the swimming pool, a pool plant building and 2.1m high fencing to enclose the proposed development. From the existing club building, the development will project approximately 20m and have a width of approximately 34m. The pool plant is located approximately 3m from the existing club building and will have a height of approximately 3.5m to the ridge and 1.9m to eaves level, with a depth of approximately 4.8m and depth of 6.8m.

The applicant recognises that the site forms part of the Green Belt and Chislehurst Conservation Area. However, it is argued by the applicant that the issue of development in the Green Belt has been considered on previous applications, which have been approved, and the new proposal would not impact detrimentally on the Green Belt. It is stated that the site can accommodate further outdoor recreation uses and preserve the open nature of the Green Belt. The following points are also made:

- the proposal is located within the curtilage of the tennis courts and health and fitness building and therefore does not detract from the open character of the Green Belt. The existing topography would ensure that the development would not be a prominent feature
- facilities have been sensitively located to ensure no detrimental impact upon the open character of the Green Belt and additional landscaping is proposed to further improve the natural amenity within the site
• the provision of an outdoor pool would increase the range and quality of leisure opportunities to existing members and within Chislehurst area
• the swimming pool will be ancillary to the existing Health and Fitness Club use on site, and no increase in levels of activity traffic and parking is anticipated as a result of the additional pool.
• unlikely that any unacceptable noise disturbance would result from the proposal
• the provision of an outdoor swimming pool at an already established health and fitness centre would provide a greater range of leisure facilities and ease pressure for new sites

Consultations

At the time of writing the report, no representations from nearby owners/ neighbours were received. Any comments will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Where swimming pools are concerned, Thames Water requests that the following conditions are adhered to with regard to the emptying of swimming pools into a public sewer to prevent the risk of flooding. The pool should be empties overnight and in dry periods; the discharge rate is controlled such that it does not exceed a flow rate of 5 litres/ second into the public sewer network. Swimming pools with a volume exceeding 10 cubic metres should contact Thames Water directly.

From a Heritage and Urban Design point of view, no objections were raised.

From an Environmental Health point of view, no objections were raised.

To date, responses have not been received from the Council's Policy, Highways or Drainage sections, the Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas (APCA), Transport for London or Bexley Council. Any comments received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Planning Considerations

This application had been treated as a Departure from the Development Plan.

The site is designated Green Belt and forms part of the Chislehurst Conservation Area.

There is a lengthy planning history on this site however the most relevant is summarised as follows.

Planning permission was granted under ref. 99/01157 and 99/0163 to demolish the existing buildings and to erect a two storey detached building for use as a health and fitness club and two tennis courts. More recently, permission was granted under ref. 01/01748 for three externally illuminated outdoor tennis courts.

The main policies relevant for this case are BE1, BE11, G1 and L1 of the Unitary Development Plan, which relate to the design of new development, development in conservation areas, the Green Belt and outdoor recreation and leisure.

Within the Green Belt there is a general presumption against inappropriate development except where very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Policy G1 in the UDP states that new building (including extensions to existing buildings) are only appropriate if used for purposes for agriculture, forestry and essential outdoor sport and recreation.
Special circumstances must be given in order to justify the swimming pool to be an ‘essential’ outdoor sport and recreation facility, and that the weight given in the justification outweighs the harm to the openness of the Green Belt.

Policy BE1 sets out the design principles that would be applied when considering proposals for new development - development should respect the scale, form and materials of adjacent buildings and should not detract from the attractive townscape that the Council wishes to secure.

BE11 relates to conservation areas. The policy outlines the criteria by which extension to buildings are expected to comply with - development should respect layout, scale form and materials and design of existing building, and ensure that the level of activity, traffic and noise does not detract from the character of the area.

With regard to Policy L1, a proposal for outdoor recreational uses on land designated as Green Belt will only be permitted provided that the following criteria is met:

- the proposal constitute appropriate development as defined by Policy G1
- within the Green Belt the proposal will provide better access to the countryside
- the activities are ancillary to the use or the development proposed are small scale and do not adversely affect character or function of the area
- it is accessible by a choice of means of transport

Government guidance in the form of PPG2 “Green Belts” advises that inappropriate development is, be definition, harmful to the Green Belt and that it is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is outweighed by other considerations (paragraph 3.2). ‘Essential facilities’ should be genuinely required uses of land, which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it.

Conclusions

The main issue in this case is whether the proposal provides an essential outdoor sporting facility, which outweighs the harm to the openness of the Green Belt and the provisions of land within it.

It can be seen that the proposed swimming pool and terrace areas are all for uses directly connected with outdoor recreation provision ancillary to the established leisure centre facility on site and this in itself maybe considered acceptable without comprising the openness and visual amenities of Green Belt and the provision of land within it.

Ancillary development is also proposed including a plant room building and close boarded timber fencing to enclose the pool/terrace area. In terms of the visual impact on the Green Belt, whilst it is recognised that the new development is proposed on an undeveloped part of the site, the applicant has attempted to minimise its visual impact through its design and siting. The proposed development is shown in the submitted drawings to respect the existing topography and retain existing ground levels. The swimming pool, terraced area and plant building will be sited within the complex of existing buildings and an area of open space will still be maintained between the existing tennis courts. The site itself already benefits from mature extensive screening around its boundaries and new timber fencing and additional planting would further screen the proposed development.
In addition, it is considered that there will be no impact on the Chislehurst Conservation Area or residential properties as the proposed swimming pool will be located within the existing complex of development and given the isolated nature of the site away from residential properties and the adjacent road, it cannot be seen from the public realm.

With regard to highway issues, whilst technical comments were not available at the time of writing this report, the proposal is to provide an extension of the leisure facilities available to members at the club. As such, 168 car parking spaces are currently available on site and it is not envisaged that the proposals would significantly intensify the use at the health and fitness club, leading to additional visitors and traffic.

On balance, it is considered that the proposal may be considered an appropriate form of outdoor recreational use on an established leisure centre use without significant harm to the visual amenities of the Green Belt and the provision of land within it, nor the character and appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area in general.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01479, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

1. ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2. ACA04 Landscaping Scheme - full app no details
   ACA04R Reason A04
3. ACC04 Matching materials
   ACC04R Reason C04
4. The pool hereby permitted should be only emptied overnight and in dry periods. The discharge rate is controlled such as it does not exceed a flow of 5 litres/second into the public sewer network.
   **Reason:** To ensure satisfactory means of water drainage.
5. Details of the materials to be used on the terraced area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
   **Reason:** In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area.
6. Details of the colour to be used for the approved fencing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
   **Reason:** In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development plan and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area.
7. AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
BE11 Conservation areas
G1 Green Belt
L1 Outdoor recreation and leisure
The applicant should contact Thames Water on 0845 9200 800 regarding the swimming pool.

   Ward: Farnborough And Crofton
   Address: 48 Crofton Road Orpington Kent BR6 8HY
   Conservation Area: NO
   OS Grid Ref: E: 545118 N: 165819
   Applicant: Mr R Stephens
   Objections: NO

Description of Development:

Side dormer extension

Proposal

This application is for a side dormer extension which would be built above a cat-slide roof to the western side of the property. It would be approximately 7.6 metres deep and 2.7 metres wide and includes a flat roof.

Consultations

Consultation letters were sent to adjoining properties. No letters of objection have been received to date.

Planning Considerations

Policies H8 (design of residential extensions), H9 (residential side space) and BE1 (design and layout of new development) of the Unitary Development Plan apply to the development and should be given due consideration. These policies seek to ensure a satisfactory standard of design, ensure an adequate separation in respect of 2 storey side extensions, and are to safeguard the overall character and amenities of the area.

Conclusions

The main issue for consideration here is whether this proposal will be acceptable in view of local planning policy which prescribes a separation of at least 1 metre in respect of two storey side extensions. There is a side space of approximately 0.65 metres.
between the western flank wall of the application property and the flank boundary of the property (with No 50 Crofton Road). This adjoining property is set closer to the boundary and so the usual separation distances between adjacent two storey buildings could not be achieved. However, the proposed dormer would be set in slightly, and Members may consider the proposed extension will appear less conspicuous in view of its overall design, as opposed to a more substantial first floor extension.

It is not considered that the amenities of neighbouring property, No. 50 will be undermined given the lack of windows along its eastern elevation and the existing proximity of No. 48 to it. The only windows there are high level.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01905, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: MEMBERS' VIEWS ARE REQUESTED

0  D00002  If Members are minded to grant planning permission the following conditions are suggested:

1  ACA01  Commencement of development 3 years
     ACA01R  A01 Reason 3 years
2  ACC04  Matching materials
     ACC04R  Reason C04
3  AJ01B  Justification GENERIC reason FULL6 apps

D00003  If Members are minded to refuse planning permission the following grounds are suggested:

1. The proposal does not comply with the Council’s requirement for a minimum 1 metre side space to be maintained to the flank boundary in respect of two-storey development in the absence of which the extension would constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene, conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed and contrary to Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.
15. Application No: 06/03592/FULL1 Ward: Copers Cope

Address: 74 Scotts Lane Bromley BR2 0LX Conservation Area: NO

OS Grid Ref: E: 538603 N: 168666

Applicant: Objections: YES

Description of Development:

Partial retention of existing building demolition and redevelopment behind the facade and front portion to provide 6 two bedroom and 2 three bedroom flats with 8 car parking spaces and cycle parking refuse storage and triple storage and storage building

Proposal

The application site comprises a large Edwardian house set within one of the largest plots present on Scotts Lane (some 30m by 80m) and currently arranged into 5 flats. The building has recently (20th April 2005) been designated a Locally Listed Building. The site benefits from an existing access adjacent to its southern boundary and its frontage is dominated by two large, mature street trees.

The surrounding area for the greater part comprises large, detached family housing, though purpose built and converted flatted schemes lie in close proximity, such as the 3 storey block at no.72 and the converted houses at nos. 70 & 78 Scotts Lane. Despite the recent alterations, the open, green character of the area remains, with consistent set back building lines and reasonable flank wall separations.

The application proposes the partial demolition of the existing building and the erection of a three storey (where the uppermost level is accommodated within the roofspace) structure behind a mostly retained and partially extended (laterally) façade. The deeper and wider building beyond the retained façade would then accommodate 6 no. two bedroom flats and 2 no. three bedroom flats. The scheme would also involve the relocation of the front site access to a central position, and the formation of an extended area of hardstanding to provide 8 parking spaces. Associated refuse and cycle storage buildings by the sites southern elevation and storage building to the rear of the site are also proposed.

The application has been amended to reduce the depth of the rearwards projection (the 7.3m overall depth has been brought down to 4m) and the bulk reduced towards the neighbouring building at no.72. Taking account of the projecting first floor rear balconies,
the depth of the rearwards extension ranges from between 4.75m and 5.1m. The lateral extension relates principally to the buildings northern flank, which would as a result of the proposed development, lie some 2.15m closer to the adjacent flank boundary, with a separation of 1.5m remaining.

**Consultations**

Nearby residents were notified of the application (including the revised details) and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- loss of trees
- inadequate parking provision
- loss of outlook
- overdevelopment
- loss of privacy
- overbearing effect of rear projection
- highway safety

**Highways** - Comment is made regarding the (unnecessarily) large area of hardstanding and the unusually sized parking spaces. Concern is also raised regarding the proposed gates and the need to reduce the time that vehicles are waiting on the highway to enter the site should be as short as possible. It is considered that the minor concern that has been raised can be adequately overcome through the imposition of conditions relating to a more efficient layout, automated gate function and the provision of adequate visibility splays etc. The distance to the proposed refuse store is also capable of being reduced to the 18m (currently lying 20m away from the highway) maximum distance recommended for such schemes by the Council.

**Trees** – No objection is made to the development and standard conditions to be imposed to ensure the protection of retained trees are recommended.

**Planning Considerations**

The proposal falls to be determined with particular regard to Policies H7, T3, T18, BE1 and BE10.

Policy H7 aims to ensure that new residential development respects the existing built and natural environment, is of appropriate density and respects the spatial standards of the area as well as amenities adjacent occupiers, and allows adequate light penetration into and between buildings.

Policy T3 seeks to ensure that off street parking provisions for new development are to approved standards.

Policy T18 requires that issues of road safety are considered in determining planning applications.

Policy BE1 requires a high standard of design in new development generally, and seeks to protect the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.
Policy BE10 aims to control the alterations made to Locally Listed Buildings, ensuring that a high standard of design is employed, and that the loss of such a building will require special justification.

Central Government advice contained in Planning Policy Statement 3 ‘Housing’ seeks more efficient use of land whilst not compromising the quality of the environment.

**Appraisal**

The main issues to be addressed in regard to this application include:

- neighbouring residential amenity
- character and appearance
- highways / Parking
- standard of accommodation proposed

**Neighbouring Residential Amenity**

The adjoining residential uses at either flank vary in their nature. To the south is a detached single dwelling, which occupies an L shaped footprint where the rear void functions as a patio area and lies adjacent to the application site boundary. This property also possesses a roof dormer facing the application site. To the north is a flatted block, Goldcrest Court, with basement parking and residential accommodation (6 no. 2 bedroom flats) across the 3 floors above (ref: 98/3152/OUT). This property possesses a limited number of flank elevation windows, which are either high level or rooflights, and thus do not overlook directly into the existing application site buildings flank fenestration. Goldcrest Court, like the application proposal, has building depth stepped away from its flank boundary, such that the inset rear elevation is set back some 2.5m from the closest point of the proposed development. Whilst this projection, combined with the footprint of Goldcrest Court, may lead to concerns of a tunnelling effect occurring to the rear facing fenestration of the inset rear elevation of Goldcrest Court, the distance of the proposed building from the closest point of that building (3.3m) and the limited projection of the building proposed, combine to alleviate that concern. It is accepted that the proposed building would result in the loss of a limited amount of direct sunlight to the windows within the inset rear elevation of Goldcrest Court, and those rooms are considered to retain a good level of daylight. The depth and proximity of the proposed building would also not harm the outlook from any neighbouring property.

Owing to the relationship of the proposed windows within the developments southern elevation to the private garden of no.76 Scotts Lane, it is considered necessary to require the majority of the windows within that elevation to be made obscure glazed, where the use of those rooms would otherwise intrude upon the privacy of the neighbouring property. Whilst the existing property does possess a limited number of windows within this elevation currently, the extension in length and height of this elevation, and the removal of an intervening, obstructing structure, require this restriction to be made. It is noted that above 1.6m from the internal finished floor level, opening windows and transparent glazing will be acceptable.

The second storey balconies, which are enclosed within the gable roofs, do not require such screens as their construction does not allow for direct lateral views. The indirect and obstructed views that are available, particularly towards Goldcrest Court, are not regarded as otherwise liable to cause a harm to neighbouring privacy, given the distance from
boundary, the presence of intervening deciduous tree screening and the communal (ie-already overlooked) nature of the neighbouring amenity space.

Concern has also been raised regarding the proximity of parking and refuse storage areas to neighbouring properties. It is necessary to adjust the position of the refuse storage slightly, and the securing of an enclosed structure would address any concerns regarding smell whilst also obstructing and thus limiting any disturbance that may have arisen through noise from the use of the proposed car parking area (as no76 may otherwise have experienced an element of disturbance in this regard).

Character and appearance

The application site building, a Locally listed Building described as an ‘attractive suburban villa’ upon its List description, is set within an unusually large and green plot within an attractive part of Beckenham. The proposed development would allow for the retention of the greater part of the front elevation, including the projecting bays and existing gable features, and build upon this appearance by introducing additional gable features. The more modern elements are for the greater part confined to the rear of the flank and the rear elevations, and thus, whilst the character will be altered significantly, the building will contribute to make a contribution to the streetscene and locality. The limited increase in bulk evident from the public frontage (as much is proposed at the rear) also allows the site to continue to retain its open and spacious character.

It is considered necessary to condition details of the proposed doors and windows, to ensure that the detailing reflects the higher quality and intricacy evident on site, and to require a greater level of screening landscaping to the forecourt parking areas, within a more efficient and attractive layout also. The increased level of hardstanding proposed is considered to be capable of being balanced by an increased level in frontage landscaping elsewhere, sufficient to continue to contribute to the verdant character of the streetscene.

Details of the proposed revised front boundaries and gates are to be reserved by condition, though it is important to point out that treatments in line with the streets low and permeable enclosures would in all likelihood prove necessary.

Highways / Parking

The application makes provision for 1:1 parking for the 8 flats proposed. This accords with UDP standards and is considered to be appropriate for the sites suburban location, where the wide, lightly parked site road is capable of meeting any overflow (eg: visitor) parking need). Though it is accepted that the site road is subject to ‘rat-running’ and its wide curves appear to encourage speeding, this is neither considered sufficient to require levels above UDP standards for on site parking, nor raising particular concern over potential limited off-site parking.

It is noted that the existing parking bay dimensions and layout are of excessive size and inefficient layout. Minor alterations are considered capable of allowing the same number of spaces to be accommodated within a smaller area of hardstanding whilst still allowing for full, practical usage. This layout is likely to be arranged in the form of two rows of bays across a central forecourt. Such an arrangement would be capable of moving the refuse and cycle storage enclosures forward so that the former would be some 15m from the highway and thus within acceptable parameters.
Standard of Accommodation Proposed

The proposed development is considered to possess room areas and flat sizes of an adequate size and layout to allow proper use, and thus while a few bedrooms windows will require mainly obscure glazing in the aim of securing neighbouring privacy, the development would allow for on the most part, adequate outlook. Daylight levels to rooms are also considered to be adequate. The large communal amenity space rear of the building allows for a good level of potential use, without impacting on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusion

The proposed development is therefore considered to provide good quality and much needed 2 and 3 bedroom accommodation whilst retaining a strong element of the character of the Locally Listed Building and not adversely impacting upon the amenities of neighbouring occupiers nor introducing a potential harm to highway safety. As has been stated above, minor modifications to the forecourt parking area are considered to be necessary, though these, like the detail of materials, boundary enclosures and landscaping etc, are considered to be capable of being addressed within conditions attached to planning permission.

Background papers referred to during the production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 06/03592, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1 ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2 ACA04 Landscaping Scheme - full app no details
   ACA04R Reason A04
3 ACA07 Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted
   ACA07R Reason A07
4 ACB01 Trees to be retained during building op.
   ACB01R Reason B01
5 ACB02 Trees - protective fencing
   ACB02R Reason B02
6 ACB03 Trees - no bonfires
   ACB03R Reason B03
7 ACB04 Trees - no trenches, pipelines or drains
   ACB04R Reason B04
8 ACB16 Trees - no excavation
   ACB16R Reason B16
9 ACH02 Satisfactory parking - no details submit
   ACH02R Reason H02
10 ACH04 Parking bays/garages
    ACH04R Reason H04
11 ACH11 Visibility splays (new buildings) (3 in) access 3.3m x 2.4m x 3.3m 1m
    ACH11R Reason H11
12 ACH18 Refuse storage - no details submitted
Details of a scheme relating to the installation of opaque privacy screens to the southern side of the proposed balcony to Flat 4 and to the northern side of that to Flat 5 shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented and retained thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure the protection of the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed 3 rearmost first floor windows and the second floor dormer windows within the southern flank elevation and the first floor bedroom window within the northern flank elevation of the proposed development shall be obscure glazed and incapable of being opened below a height equal to 1.6m above the finished floor level of the applicable floor and shall subsequently be permanently maintained as such, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

**Reason:** To ensure the protection of the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

**Policies (UDP)**
- BE1 Design of new development
- BE10 Locally listed buildings
- H7 Housing design
- T3 Parking
- T18 Road safety

**INFORMATIVE(S)**

1. RDI16 Layout of Crossovers etc

---

**16. Application No:** 06/03950/FULL1

**Ward:** Clock House

**Address:** 162 Ravenscroft Road Beckenham Kent BR3 4TW

**Conservation Area:** NO

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 535483 N: 169405

**Applicant:** Recoil Ltd UK

**Objections:** YES

**Description of Development:**
Replacement single storey light industrial (class B1) building

Proposal

The application site lies upon a predominantly residential road, characterised by terraced and semi-detached dwellings. The application site forms part of a light industrial enclave within the road, and is bounded by commercial uses to one side (northeast) and to the rear (a currently unused warehouse) with a footpath and residential property beyond to the south western flank. The site is currently occupied by a pitched roof building located against the south western boundary, being some 10.6m wide, 19.9m deep and between 3m (eaves) and 5.95m (ridge) high. The existing rendered building exerts an unkempt appearance which does little to bely its industrial nature.

The proposed pitched roof building is to be arranged along the same axis, and being some 9.6m wide, 20m deep (with a pitched roof overhang of some 500mm beyond) and between 4.2m (eaves) and 5.9m (ridge) high, occupies largely the same position and dimensions as the existing building, though now includes a separation of 1.5m from flank wall to the boundary with the adjoining side (south western) footpath. The proposed new building, unlike the existing structure, possesses a partial mezzanine floor, occupying some 54m² (of which, due to headroom restrictions, only approximately 50% of which is fully usable).

The proposed building is to be constructed from a brickwork lower section, with cladding panels and glazing to side elevations, with full height brickwork front and rear elevations, with a significant glazed area to the front elevation. Rooflight windows and solar panels to the metal roof are also proposed. Associated landscaping and boundary treatments would also prove necessary, though full details of these have not been provided at this stage.

Consultations

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

- no objection, subject to new building not being higher than existing
- concern regarding construction associated disturbances

Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
ER8 Noise Pollution
T3 Parking
T18 Road Safety
EMP6 Development Outside Business Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Decision Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/03950/FULL</td>
<td>Replacement single storey light industrial (class B1) building</td>
<td>PCO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
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.

Having regard to the above, as the proposed building is of an equivalent height, width and depth, and exerts an appearance considerably more appropriate for the mainly residential area than the untidy, utilitarian existing building and other structures typical of B1 uses, the scheme would represent a considerable improvement to the appearance of the streetscene and area.

In regard to neighbouring residential amenity, being of an approximate bulk and position, with equivalent floorspace and thus likely intensity of use, neither the use of or the presence of the proposed building is considered to be liable to exert any increased harm to residential amenity. The nature of the operations on site, which are to be continued, are considered to accord with B1 (light industrial) Class Use, and are generally considered to be appropriate for the mainly residential area. As such, the development is considered to propose the continuation of a commercial activity which does not impact adversely upon its surrounding occupiers or environment and thus is not objectionable.

Standard conditions regarding materials submission, landscaping, non-opening windows and restrictions on permitted development rights, the latter two of which are considered necessary given the neighbouring residential usage. The assessment of the details to be provided in regard to parking and boundary enclosures are considered to be capable of ensuring that the site use will not result in an increase in parking off-site, nor pose a threat to highway safety.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 06/03950, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 14.05.2007

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

1. ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
2. ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
3. ACA07 Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted
4. ACA07R Reason A07
5. ACC01 Satisfactory materials
6. ACC01R Reason C01
7. ACH02 Satisfactory parking - no details submit
8. ACH02R Reason H02
9. ACJ03 No outside storage
10. ACJ06 Restricted hours of use on any day 7am 9pm

**Reason:** In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the area.
Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the area.

7  ACK02    No mezz floor/roof space accom (1in) a mezzanine
    ACK02R   K02 reason (1 insert)  BE1

8  Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no alteration permitted by Class A of Part 8 of Schedule 2 of the 1995 Order, shall be made within the curtilage(s) of the building 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 area.

9  ACK09    Soil survey - contaminated land
    ACK09R   K09 reason

10 AJ02B    Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
ER8 Noise pollution
ER7 Contaminated land
T3 Parking
T18 Road safety
EMP6 Development outside business areas

17. Application No : 06/04418/FULL1 Ward : Orpington
Address : Land Adjacent To 93 Felstead Road
           Orpington Kent
Conservation Area: NO

OS Grid Ref: E: 546642  N: 165665
Applicant : Mr A Howell
Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Detached two storey four bedroom house

Proposal

A detached two storey 4-bed dwelling is proposed by this application. It is located on the northern side of Felstead Road, a residential road with a mix of detached and semi-detached 2 storey dwelling houses in the vicinity. Levels vary in the location with the land rising to the east and falling away to the north and west of the site. Parking will be provided by way of hardstanding to the front of the house, for two cars.
Consultations

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

- development too large and out of character
- out of scale and oppressive in nature
- extent of rearward projection
- lack of parking for No.93
- overshadowing and loss of light to No.97

Revised plans were received on 3rd May which reduced the rearward projection by the deletion of the single storey element. No objections have been received to date following re-notification.

Regarding drainage the Environment Agency raise no objections to the proposed development, subject to comments and advice (see informative and conditions).

Thames Water raise no objection with regard sewerage and water infrastructure.

Highways raise no objection subject to conditions; any additional comments raised as a result of revised plans will be reported verbally to Committee.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan: BE1 Design of New Development and H7 New Residential. The planning history of the site includes a previous planning refusal, reference 06/02897, for a 3 storey development, the grounds of refusal referring to over-development, out of character and detrimental to nearby residential amenities.

Conclusion

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 presents an ‘infill’ between 2 existing 2 storey dwelling houses; it would seem historically a house was intended to be built here (the house numbers go from 93 to 97). The levels in this location rise to the east which results in the application site being at a lower level to 97, but on a similar level to the dwelling that the site was severed from, 93. The levels also fall away to the rear of the site (north).

There is a strong front building line to the houses in this location and the current proposal maintains this. There is also a mix of house styles within the vicinity; the proposed design is considered acceptable within the street scene.

Local objections raised issues with overshadowing and loss of light to 97; no representation has been received in respect of the revised plans. In terms of the impact on the neighbours at no.97, the 2 storey projection beyond no 97 is c 3.2m; the single storey element has now been deleted. It should be noted that the gardens in this location face in a northerly direction. Given this, the extent of the projections and that
97 is at a higher level, whilst there will be some visual impact it may not be considered sufficient to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

In terms of the impact on 93, the 2 storey element projects beyond the rear of 93 by c 2.3m and the revised plans show the deletion of the single storey element. Given the separation and extent of projection this relationship may be considered acceptable.

The proposal sees a reduction in the extent of development from that previously refused under ref. 06/02897 and may now on balance be considered to warrant a grant of planning permission without significant harm to local visual and residential amenity.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 06/02897 and 06/04418, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 03.05.2007

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACA04 Landscaping Scheme - full app no details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACA04R Reason A04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACA07 Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACA07R Reason A07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ACC01 Satisfactory materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC01R Reason C01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ACI02 Rest of &quot;pd&quot; Rights - Class A, B,C and E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason: ___

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A side space of 1 metre shall be provided between the eastern flank wall of the development hereby permitted and the flank boundary of the property and the western flank wall of the development hereby permitted and the flank boundary of the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACI09R Reason I09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ACI17 No additional windows (2 inserts) western and eastern development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACI17R I17 reason (1 insert) BE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Details of the vehicular crossover shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority and the access arrangements shall be substantially completed before any part of the development is first occupied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason: In the interest of vehicular and pedestrian safety.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Details of the drainage system for surface water drainage to prevent the discharge of surface water drainage from private land onto the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) prior to commencement of works and the drainage system shall be completed to the LPA’s satisfaction before first occupation of the dwelling hereby permitted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason: In the interest of the amenity of the area.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ACH12 Vis. splays (vehicular access) (2 in) 3.3m x 2.4m x 3.3m 1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACH12R Reason H12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ACD02 Surface water drainage - no det. submitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACD02R Reason D02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
H7 Housing density and design
H9 Side space
INFORMATIVE(S)

1 You should seek engineering advice from the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre with regards to reinstatement of any damage to the highway. Please contact Henry Clive of Street Services on 020 8313 4926.

2 Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991, written approval of the Environment Agency is required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent into controlled waters, and may be required for any discharge of sewage or trade effluent from buildings or fixed plant into or onto the ground or into waters which are not controlled waters. Such approval may be withheld. (Controlled waters include rivers, streams, underground waters, reservoirs, estuaries and coastal waters). The applicant is advised to contact the Authorisations Team (on 01732 223152) to discuss the matter further.

18. Application No : 07/00825/RECON Ward : Bromley Town
Address : St. Pauls House Edison Road Bromley Kent BR2 0EP Conservation Area: NO
OS Grid Ref: E: 540021 N: 169335
Applicant : Patricia Earling Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Removal of condition 01 of ref. 03/03708 allowed on appeal to permit the use to be permanent. Variation of condition 04 to increase the number of registered attendees to the premises to 40 per day and hold up to two therapeutic groups per week with max of 10 attendees for each group. Variation of condition 05 to allow a single day a week to operate between 9.00 hours and 20.00 hours

Proposal
St Pauls House Edison Road is situated at the north of Bromley High Street off Church Road. This 1 and 2 storey building was allowed planning permission on appeal on the 28 August 2004 for the change of use from offices to addiction clinic run by the South London Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and the Bromley Advice and Information Service (BAIS).

Planning permission is sought for the removal of condition 01 of ref. 03/03708 allowed on appeal in order that the use may be carried out on a permanent basis; and variation of condition 04 to increase the number of registered attendees to the premises to 40 per day and hold up to two therapeutic groups per week with max of 10 attendees for each group; variation of condition 05 to allow a single day a week to operate between 9.00 hours and 20.00 hours

The permission is to remove condition 01 is to enable the centre to have a permanent consent.

Variation to condition 04 will allow the service more flexibility to see clients more frequently in initial stages of treatment or as the need arises, rather than restrict the daily numbers. Variation of condition 05 will allow the service to see more of the clients who are unable to attend the centre during the day (such as those working or with other responsibilities)

Consultations

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

- there has been a number of unsavoury characters and anti social behaviour locally since the centre first opened, including alcohol and drugs in the Martins Hill Park

From the highways aspect the car parking spaces shall continue to be used by clients and staff of the centre.

Environmental Heath Officer: any comments will be reported verbally at the meeting

Planning Considerations

The proposal falls to be considered with regard to Policies C1, C4 and C5 Unitary Development Plan. These policies offer general support for the provision of public service, health and community facilities subject to the criteria that the privacy and amenities of adjoining residents are adequately safeguarded, the proposal does not have an impact on on-street parking and highway safety, and that the uses are located so as to maximise access by means of transport other than by car.

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
C1 Community facilities
C4 Health facilities
C5 Facilities for Vulnerable Groups
T3 Parking
T18 Road safety
Planning Application History

The previous use of the building was as offices and retail shop used by the British Red Cross between 1993 and 2003.

Planning permission was allowed on appeal following the council’s refusal of application ref. 03/03708 for the change of use from offices and ancillary retail (Class B1) to drug rehabilitation and information service (Class D1).

The application was subsequently on appeal subject to the following conditions:

- the use hereby permitted shall be discontinued and the land reinstated to its former condition on or before 31 August 2007.
- the premises shall be used for a drug rehabilitation and information service and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class D1 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).
- the use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the South London and Maudsley NHS Trust (Bromley Advice and Information Service).
- the number of persons registered or recorded as attending the premises in connection with treatment programmes or advice provided by the occupiers of the premises in connection with the use hereby permitted shall not exceed 15 on any day.
- the use shall not operate on any Sunday, or Bank Holiday, Christmas Day or Good Friday, nor before 09.00hrs or after 17.00hrs on any other day except for a single weekday once every two weeks when the use can operate until 20.00 hrs.
- the premises shall not be brought into use until details of the parking spaces to be used by clients and employees of the use hereby permitted at the application site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and the approved spaces shall be retained thereafter and kept available for such use.

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that the increased number of attendees to the centre 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.

It is considered that the use of these premises by the BAIS is acceptable in terms of adopted policies of the Unitary Development Plan. The use is one which is a recognised community use and which offers a highly valued service to the wider community. The applicants have demonstrated sufficient safeguards in their operation so that local residents would not be affected by the use.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the continued use of the centre 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.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/00825, excluding exempt information.
RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. The premises shall be used for drug rehabilitation and information service and no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class D1 of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (use Classes) Order 1087, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification)
   ACI16R   I16 reason

2. The use hereby permitted shall be carried out only by the South London and Maudsley NHS (Bromley Advice and Information Service)
   ACE04R   Reason E04

3. The number of persons registered or recorded as attending the premises in connection with treatment programs or advice provided by the occupiers in connection with the use hereby permitted shall not exceed 40 on any day
   ACI06R   Reason I06

4. The use shall not operate on any Sunday, Bank Holiday, Christmas Day or Good Friday, nor before 9.00hrs or after 17.00hrs on any other day except for a single weekday once a week when the use can operate until 20.00hrs
   ACJ05R   J05 reason BE1

5. The existing car parking spaces used by the clients and employees of the use hereby permitted shall be permanently retained
   Reason: In order to comply with Policies BE1, T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interests of the amenities of adjacent properties

6. AJ02B   Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of New Development
T3 Parking
T18 Road Safety

19. Application No : 07/00798/FULL6     Ward : Biggin Hill
    Address : 38 Sutherland Avenue Biggin Hill
               Westerham Kent TN16 3HE
    Conservation Area:NO
    OS Grid Ref: E: 542012 N: 158528
    Applicant : Mr And Mrs Boyce
    Objections : NO

Description of Development:
Single storey front and rear extensions and increased width of rear dormer plus replacement decking to rear

Proposal

This application is for single storey front and rear extensions and for a wider rear dormer, together with replacement decking to the rear of the property.

Consultations

Consultation letters were sent to adjoining properties. No letters of objection have been received to date.

Planning Considerations

Policies H8 (design of residential extensions) and BE1 (design and layout of new development) of the Unitary Development Plan apply to the development and should be given due consideration. These policies seek to ensure a satisfactory standard of design and are to safeguard the overall character and amenities of the area.

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 front extension is essentially an “infill” and should not affect the streetscene or neighbouring amenity.

The rearward single storey extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of its depth, approximately 2.3 metres and on the basis that of the location of neighbouring property, No 36 Sutherland Avenue. The main part of the replacement decking would be located approximately 4.4 metres away from No 36 and this is considered to be an adequate separation. In addition there is dense screening with other neighbouring property, 38A Sutherland Avenue.

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.

Background papers referred to during the writing of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/00798, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 01.06.2007

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1 ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2 ACC04 Matching materials
   ACC04R Reason C04
3 ACI13 No windows (2 inserts) flank rear extension
Details of the decking to be installed to the rear of the extension hereby approved shall be approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority before the development is first occupied, and this shall be permanently maintained as such thereafter.

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

20. Application No: 07/01372/FULL6 Ward: Shortlands
Address: 102 South Hill Road Bromley BR2 0RT Conservation Area: NO
OS Grid Ref: E: 539110 N: 168594
Applicant: Mr C Barber Objections: YES

Description of Development:
Part one/two storey side/rear extension

Proposal

The application site comprises a two storey detached house situated towards the north-western end of South Hill Road close to the junction with Kingswood Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential characterised mainly by semi-detached properties.

The proposal is for a part one/two storey extension to the north west side of the property which continues across the back of the property to form a two storey rear extension. The application is a revision of a scheme previously refused under ref. 07/00660.

Consultations

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

- concerns over size and depth, in particular at the rear
- extension would project out to almost a third of the length of No. 104’s rear garden
- the outlook from the back garden of No.104 would be adversely affected
- extensions would make garden of 104 feel like a walled garden
- loss of light
• plans appear to have had little alteration from first application
• length and height of extension will be overpowering

Planning Considerations

Policies BE1, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan apply to the development and should be given due consideration. These policies seek to ensure a satisfactory standard of design and safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties, the spatial characteristics of the area and the visual amenities of the area.

The previous application at this site was refused on the grounds that it did not comply with the Council’s requirement to retain a 1 metre side space between the flank boundary of the property and the flank wall of the two storey side extension. In addition, it was considered that the depth of projection was excessive and would have been detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining dwellings by reason of overshadowing, loss of light and visual impact.

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 applicants have now revised the scheme as follows:

• existing garage to be demolished and re-built leaving a 1 metre side space to the flank boundary
• overall depth of extension reduced from approx 4.5 to 3.8 metres
• depth of extension at first floor level closest to boundary with No.104 reduced from approx 3.1 to 1.3 metres (as scaled from the existing rear elevation of the building).

The resulting impact of the revised scheme with these alterations will be considerably reduced. Due to the positioning of No.100 South Hill Road, which is set slightly further back from No.102, the rear extension will only project a further 0.8 metres rearwards of No.100. Furthermore, the flank wall of the extension will be positioned approximately 2 metres away from the boundary so overall will have no significant impact on this property.

With regard to the impact of the extensions upon No. 104, it is considered that the reduced depth of the part of the extension adjacent to the boundary along with the 1 metre side space now proposed should not cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to those occupants.

In addition the re-positioning of the garage wall means that the proposal now complies with the Council’s policy of maintaining a 1 metre side space to the flank boundary in respect of two storey developments.

In this instance therefore it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in an unacceptable loss of amenity to local residents nor impact detrimentally on the character of the area.
Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 07/00660 and 07/01372, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R  A01 Reason 3 years
2. ACC04 Matching materials
   ACC04R  Reason C04
3. ACI13 No windows (2 inserts) north-west or south-east part one/two storey side/rear extension
   ACI13R  I13 reason (1 insert) BE1 and H8
4. AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)

BE1 Design of New Development
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space

---

    Address : 84 - 86 Bromley Road Beckenham Kent BR3 5NP Conservation Area: Chancery Lane
    OS Grid Ref: E: 537950 N: 169410
    Applicant : John Lewis Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Retention of existing air conditioning unit on rear elevation of commercial premises

Proposal

The applicant has erected an air conditioning unit on the ground floor rear elevation of his premises to meet health and safety workplace requirements for the embroidery business on site.

The site is within the Chancery Lane Conservation Area.
Planning permission is sought retrospectively following complaints from local residents about the location of the air conditioning unit.

Consultations

One adjoining owner and the local resident’s association have submitted objections to the proposal which can be summarised as:

- visually intrusive in the Conservation Area
- air conditioning unit should be re-located to ensure it is not visible from within the Conservation Area.

APCA object to the current location of the air conditioning unit and recommend it be re-located to a less visually intrusive location.

There are no technical objections from an environmental health point of view regarding the noise of the air conditioning unit as it is considered one of the quietest models currently available.

Planning Considerations

The site is located within a mixed use parade of businesses along Bromley Road and is within the Chancery Lane Conservation Area.

The proposal requires consideration of Policies BE1 (Design of New Development) and BE11 (Conservation Areas) of the UDP.

Policy BE1 (Design of New Development) requires that any new development be of a high standard of design and layout in order to create an attractive townscape and pleasant living and working conditions.

BE11 (Conservation Areas) requires that all new development within a Conservation Area should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. New development should complement the area in respect of scale, layout, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces.

Conclusions

The air conditioning unit is required to ensure health and safety legislation is complied with regarding work place ambient room temperatures. The applicant has limited options for locating the air conditioning unit. The applicant owns the ground floor of the building only and the existing porch limits where the unit can be sited on his rear elevation walls. The boundary wall running along Chancery Lane is not within his ownership.

It is noted that normally such service equipment is required to be on the rear elevation of buildings within Conservation Areas. The applicant has sought to locate it on the rear elevation, but unfortunately given the limited options available for siting, it is still visually apparent in the Chancery Conservation Area.

Technical advice has been sought regarding possible screening around the unit, however the screen would have to have a minimum clearance of 1m from the unit to avoid over-
heating and fire risk. Screening is therefore not considered suitable as it would make the unit much larger and most likely more visually intrusive in the Conservation Area.

The rear elevation of buildings from 72 – 86 Bromley Road currently has a number of large ventilation ducts, many satellite dishes, and white UPVC down-pipes. This is all visually apparent from within the Chancery Lane Conservation Area, although not so visible from Chancery Lane itself.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the air conditioning unit is visually apparent in the Chancery Lane Conservation Area, it is considered that the applicant has sought to locate it in the best practicable location.

The air conditioning unit can be removed at any time in the future without causing irreversible damage to the valued characteristics of the Conservation Area.

In recognition of the health and safety requirements and the fact that there will be no permanent damage to the valued characteristics of the Conservation Area, and noting other such service equipment within the area, it is considered that on balance the air conditioning unit will not have a permanent adverse effect on the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/01518, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

1. AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
BE11 Conservation areas
INFORMATIVE(S)

1. In the event that the air conditioning unit is no longer required, the unit and all other associated equipment shall be removed and any damage to the building shall be repaired to match existing.

2. You are advised that should the air conditioning unit be required to be replaced in the future with a different model to that permitted under ref. 07/01518, a new planning application will be required to be submitted for approval to the Local Planning Authority.
Description of Development:

Conversion of existing 2 flats into 6 two bedroom flats

Proposal

The property a large two storey Victorian house a situated in Rodway Road north of the town centre. This proposal is for a two storey front and side extension/elevation alterations and conversion into 6 two bedroom flats with 6 car parking spaces and refuse storage.

Consultations

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

- overdevelopment of the site.
- the character of the area will be adversely affected by the creation of more flats.
- the proposal would contribute to on street parking with visitors cars
- the proposed vehicular parking and access arrangements are located on a dangerous 90 degree bend which would be dangerous to vehicular and highway safety.

With regard to drainage matters no technical objections are raised.

From a Highways point of view, the proposed parking and access layout together with provision for the refuse to be collected from the front is acceptable

Environmental Health Officer (Housing); has no objections

Waste advisor has no objections.

Planning Considerations

Under planning ref. 06/04383, permission was refused for the conversion into 4 two and 2 one bedroom flats and 2 bedsits with 8 car parking spaces and refuse storage, on the following grounds:

- the proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site by reason of the amount of site coverage by buildings and hard surfaces and would be out of character with the area contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
the proposed extension by reason of its size, height and bulk would appear bulky and over dominant on this prominent corner site contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

the proposed development by reason of the number of units proposed would be out of character with the pattern of surrounding development resulting in an over intensive use of the site contrary to Policies H7, H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

the proposed development would intensify the use of vehicular access to the property and would also be likely to lead to conditions prejudicial to the free flow and general safety of traffic along Rodway Road contrary to Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

the property is located in a prominent location on a significant curve in the road, the proposed side extension would be highly visible and appears bulky and out of character and scale with the original house and surrounding properties. The side extension results in an unsymmetrical appearance to the existing house.

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies BE1, H7, H8, H9, T11 and T3 of the Unitary Development Plan.

BE1 Design of New Development: requires a high standard of design in new development generally, and seeks to protect the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties.

H7 Housing Density and Design: site layout, buildings and space about the buildings are designed to high qualities.

H8 Residential Extensions: relates to residential extensions. It requires that the scale, form and materials should compliment the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

H9 Side Space: a minimum of 1m side space is to protect spatial standards.

T11 New Accesses: to ensure new accesses will not create a road safety hazard.

T3 Parking:

T18 Road safety; requires that road safety is not adversely affected.

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 principle of the usage of the property in flats has already been established by application WK/3/50/219 granting permission for conversion of the property into two flats. The existing property is currently in use as two flats with the first floor flat having a separate door towards the side of the existing house with a balcony and amenity area above the existing single storey side extension.

This application has been submitted following the refusal of the previous application 06/04383. The proposal has reduced the bulk of the previous extension by concentrating the two storey extension as an infill to the front of the property, and a pitched roof is proposed over the existing single storey extension. The number of flats has been reduced.
from 8 units to 6 units and the car parking now proposed is 6 spaces to the front of the property.

It is considered that in comparison with ref. 06/04383 the removal of the two storey side extension has reduced the bulky appearance of the proposal and the reduction in the number of flats has reduced the number of car parking spaces required.

Having had regard to the above it is considered that on balance the siting, size and design of the proposed extensions is acceptable and in keeping with the scale of the host building and that it would not impact detrimentally on the character of the area.

Furthermore there are numerous properties in Rodway Road that are in multiple occupancy, for example Nos 31,33 37 and 39 which are opposite the site and Nos 18 and 22 to the rear which are currently in flats. Members may consider therefore that the proposals are acceptable without significant detriment to the character of the area or local visual and residential amenity in general.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 06/04383 and 07/01531, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACC04 Matching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC04R Reason C04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACH12 Vis. splays (vehicular access) (2 in) 3.3m x 2.4m x 3.3m 1m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACH12R Reason H12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ACH22 Bicycle Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACH22R Reason H22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There shall be no obstruction to visibility in excess of 1m in height within 2.4m x 43m zone around the bend for parking space No. 6 except for trees selected by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, which shall be permanently maintained. Details of the visibility shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority before commencement of any works on the development hereby permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACH11R Reason H11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Details of the drainage system for surface water drainage to prevent the discharge of surface water from private land onto the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by or on behalf of the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of works and the drainage system shall be completed to Local Planning Authority’s satisfaction before first occupation of the development hereby permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason: To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No loose materials shall be used for surfacing of the parking area hereby permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACH17R Reason H17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 Policies (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
You should seek engineering advice from the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre with regards to reinstatement of any damage to the highway. Please contact Bernadette Houckham of Street Services on 020 8313 4927.

Any repositioning, alteration and/or adjustment to street furniture or Statutory Undertaker's apparatus, considered necessary and practical to complete the development hereby permitted, shall be undertaken at the cost of the applicant.

RDI15 Highway obstructions
RDI16 Layout of Crossovers etc

23. Application No : 07/01679/FULL1 Ward : Chelsfield And Pratts Bottom
Address : 6 The Meadows Orpington Kent BR6 6HS Conservation Area: NO
OS Grid Ref: E: 547168 N: 163535
Applicant : Mid Kent Homes Objections : YES

Description of Development:

5 bedroom detached house

Proposal

The site is located within a residential area of Chelsfield that is characterised by detached dwellings of various styles and sizes. It currently comprises a detached gable ended bungalow with a detached single garage with vehicular access onto The Meadows. The property is elevated slightly above ground level and is set back from the road beyond an open front lawn. The rear garden is approx. 25m (w) x 28m (d).

The neighbouring property at No. 8 is also a bungalow and is set approx. 7.4m away from the shared flank boundary with the subject property. On the other side at No. 4 is a recently erected 2 storey house with detached double garage; this property is set back 2m
from the flank boundary. On the opposite side of the road at nos. 9 and 11 there are 2 bungalows both on a lower ground level than the application property.

It is now proposed to erect a detached 2 storey 5 bedroom house with integral double garage. The proposed dwelling would be set off the common flank boundary with No. 4 by approx. 2.7m [excluding chimney breast] and project some 1.25m beyond the main rear wall of this property. Five windows are shown on this elevation, 3 secondary windows at ground floor level serving the living room and 2 first floor windows serving en-suite and dressing both these rooms are shown to be obscure glazed.

On the opposite side, the dwelling would be set in 2m from the boundary with No. 8, no windows are shown on this elevation and the proposed house would extend approximately 4.3m beyond the rear of this property, roughly inline with the existing garage. The dwelling would have a maximum height of 9.7m, as scaled from the plans.

Whilst there are no protected trees on the site, there are several of particular amenity value, however no trees are shown to be felled.

The agent has been requested to provide a street scene plan, which will aid consideration of this application and enable a greater appreciation of the proposals impact upon the street scene. Permission also exists for an enlarged dwelling at No. 8, resulting in two storeys of accommodation, the upper floor being within the roof.

Consultations

From a tree point of view no significant trees would be affected by this proposal.

No technical objections are raised in respect of drainage issues.

From the highways aspect, conditions are suggested in the event of a grant of permission. Concerns have been raised about the possible conflict between construction vehicles, given that several development sites are currently operating in this cul-de-sac but this matter is not a matter that can be reasonably controlled under planning.

Representations have been received from the occupant of the neighbouring house at No. 4 who raises the following points:

- side elevation window to master bedroom would overlook the rear of property
- if existing drains / sewage junction needs to be moved and full consultation would be necessary

Planning Considerations

The relevant policies are H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan, which require new development to be in keeping with the character and spatial standards of the surrounding areas, to respect the amenities of adjoining properties and have regard for important trees and planting on the development site.

National guidance in PPG3 Housing encourages local planning authorities to maximise the potential of sites such as this while at the same time producing good design compatible with adjoining development.
Under ref. 07/00167 an application was submitted for a very similar proposal comprising erection of detached 5 bedroom house. This application was subsequently withdrawn; the main differences are as follows:

- c1.35m reduction in height of double garage roof
- 2.8m reduction in depth of the dwelling closest to No.4
- approx. 1.4m increase in depth of dwelling closest to No.8
- deletion of first floor secondary master bedroom window, obscure glazing to remaining 2
- 0.7m reduction in the overall width

Under planning ref. 98/02963 planning permission was granted for a replacement dwelling at No.4 on a site of an equivalent size. The proposed building was of a similar height and scale maintaining approx. 2m to each boundary, the main difference was the inclusion of a detached 2 storey double garage with habitable accommodation above to the side of the house on this earlier scheme.

**Conclusions**

It is considered that the current application would not unduly impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property in view of the level of separation between properties. The proposal would also be commensurate in terms of its scale with similar recent and intended development within this road.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref. 07/00167, excluding exempt information.

**RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION**

**Subject to the following conditions:**

1. ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
   ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
2. ACA07 Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted
   ACA07R Reason A07
3. ACB05 Replacement tree(s) elsewhere on site
   ACB05R Reason B05
4. ACC01 Satisfactory materials
   ACC01R Reason C01
5. ACH03 Satisfactory parking - full application
   ACH03R Reason H03
6. ACH16 Hardstanding for wash-down facilities
   ACH16R Reason H16
7. ACI02 Rest of "pd" Rights - Class A, B,C and E
   Reason: In order to comply with Policies H6 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to prevent an overdevelopment of the site in the interests of the visual and residential amenities of the area.
8. ACI17 No additional windows (2 inserts) western flank dwelling
   ACI17R I17 reason (1 insert) H6
9. ACI12 Obscure glazing (1 insert) on the first floor western flank elevation
   ACI12R I12 reason (1 insert) H6
10. AJ02B Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps
You should seek engineering advice from the Environmental Services Department at the Civic Centre regarding the temporary crossover for construction access and any damage caused to the highway by associated construction traffic (Alan Steadman 020 8313 4908).

Ward: Chelsfield And Pratts Bottom  
Address: 16 Ryarsh Crescent Orpington Kent BR6 9SQ  
Conservation Area: NO  
OS Grid Ref: E: 545497 N: 164703  
Applicant: Miss Tracy Ennis  
Objections: NO  

Description of Development:  
Revised decking and boundary fencing  

Proposal  
The application proposes revisions to existing rear garden decking and boundary fence works to overcome the grounds of a previous refusal and a dismissed appeal (on original retrospective application ref. 05/03758).

Consultations  
To date no responses have been received from consulted residents.

Planning Considerations  
These amended proposals result from the appeal Inspector’s comments in allowing the rear conservatory extension to this modern inner-terraced house and dismissing the retention of the decking.

In respect of the latter it was suggested these features should be negotiated with the local planning authority to achieve a more acceptable reduced construction.
Accordingly a site meeting has been carried out and the current plan reflects the issues that required amendment. The applicants were clearly misled by the original contractor as no permitted development rights would have covered the scope of the works built here. A selection of photographs as built are within the refused application ref. 05/03758, indicating the extent of the construction, which clearly involved considerable expense.

Conclusions

The current plans concern the garden decking/fencing and indicate a 600mm drop in flooring level on the upper deck and a 400mm drop on the lower deck with associated fencing to a maximum height of 2m from these areas. The staircase incline is also reduced to accommodate the new levels. The rear boundary fence to an access path will be 2m max height with a decorative trellis on top to increase privacy to houses at a lower level in Borkwood Park. Members may consider that these modification works are sufficient and meet the appeal Inspectors comments.

Background papers referred to during the production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 05/03758, 07/01745 and appeal 06/00130/578, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1 ACA01 Commencement of development 3 years
ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years

2 The modification to the decking and fencing hereby permitted shall be completed by 31st December 2007 and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In order to secure an acceptable form of decking to safeguard the privacy of neighbouring properties and to comply with Policies H8 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

3 AJ01B Justification GENERIC reason FULL6 apps

25. Application No: 07/01827/FULL1 Ward: Plaistow And Sundridge
Address: The Teasel Burnt Ash Lane Bromley BR1 5AJ Conservation Area: NO
OS Grid Ref: E: 540647 N: 171112
Applicant: Kelsey Houseing Association Objections: NO
Description of Development:

Detached single storey building at rear for water tank and pump station

Proposal

The site lies towards the northern end of Burnt Ash Lane a short distance beyond the local shopping centre. Previously occupied by the public house known as ‘The Teasel’, the site is now being developed as a block of flats with car-parking spaces.

The proposal is for a detached single storey building at the rear of the new block of flats and is to accommodate a water tank and pumping station to enable the water supply to reach the upper floors of the building.

The proposed building will measure 3.590m wide x 3.815m depth x 2.950 high as shown on the submitted drawings and will be constructed of brick to match the ground floor finish of the main building, and a concrete roof.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application.

No representations have been received at the date of this report.

With regard to drainage matters no technical objections are raised.

Thames Water has no objections.

Environmental Health have no objections.

Any additional comments received will be reported verbally at the meeting.

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of new development

Planning permission was been granted under ref: 05/02481/FULL1 for the erection of part four/five storey building comprising 35 flats (1 one bedroom, 29 two bedroom and 5 three bedroom), with roof terraces and cycle parking storage area, detached refuse store, 43 surface car parking spaces, access road and landscaping.

The development is currently under construction.

Conclusions

The proposed building is to house a water tank and pumping station for the block of flats currently under construction, its position is to the north west corner of the site abutting the boundary of Pike Close. The site was previously allocated as landscaped area consisting of grass and a tree.
The design is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy BE1 and due to its siting is considered to have minimal impact on adjoining residents.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 07/01827 and 05/02481, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1. ACA01
   ACA01R
   Commencement of development 3 years
   A01 Reason 3 years

2. AJ02B
   Justification UNIQUE reason OTHER apps

Policy (UDP)
BE1 Design of new development
26. Application No: 07/00671/FULL6
Ward: Biggin Hill

Address: 1 Fairchilds School Cottages Skid Hill Lane Warlingham Surrey CR6 9PP
Conservation Area: NO

OS Grid Ref: E: 539608 N: 160871

Applicant: Miss Nelson-Greenwood
Objections: NO

Description of Development:

Single storey rear extension

Proposal

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension to the above property which is located in Skid Hill Lane, Warlingham. This is a locally listed building situated within the Green Belt. This property is situated at the beginning of a row of three pairs of semi-detached properties, which was converted from a school in 1948.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers have been notified of the application and no representations have been received to date. Any representations received will be reported verbally.

From the heritage and urban design aspect concerns have been raised over the size of the proposed conservatory in light of the previous extension. The officer is concerned about the appearance of the proposed conservatory as the plans do not show the detail/material and as such it has the potential to look like a bulky and obtrusive “add on” to the building?

Planning Considerations

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

Policy BE1, Design of New Development, states that all proposals should be of a high standard of design and layout, and should be attractive, complement the scale, form, layout and materials of the adjacent buildings and respect the existing street scene.

Policies H8, Residential Extensions, states that the design and layout of proposals should respect the host dwelling, compatible with development in the surrounding area and space
between buildings should be respected or maintained when these contribute to the character of the area.

Policy G4, Extensions and Alterations to dwelling houses within the Green Belt, states that extensions and alterations to the dwelling house should only be permitted if the net increase of the floor area over that of the original house is less than 10%, the size, siting, materials and design do not harm the visual amenities or the open or rural character and the development does not result in a significant detrimental change in the overall form, bulk or character of the original dwelling house.

This property has received a previous refusal for planning permission for a single storey rear extension ref. 06/04443.

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.

A previous application for a conservatory to the rear of the property was refused under ref. 06/0443 due to “the property being a locally listed building situated within the Green Belt and the cumulative impact of the proposed extension together with the previous addition would result in inappropriate development, harmful to the openness and character of the Green Belt contrary to Policy G4 of the Unitary Development Plan”. This current application has reduced the floor area of the conservatory by 1.4 m². This property was previously extended in 1998 ref. 98/02952. This extension was for a two storey side extension and from looking at the current application the floor area of that extension was approximately 72.5 m². Therefore combined with the proposed conservatory of 13.4 m² the overall increase of floor area would be over 90% which is contrary to Policy G4 which states that there should be no more than a 10% net increase of the original dwelling house.

Having had regard to the above it is considered that the development in the manner proposed would be harmful to the Green Belt and contrary to the adopted policy.

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.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 07/00671, 07/00206 and 06/04443, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 05.06.2007

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:
1. The property is a locally listed building within the Green Belt and the cumulative impact of the proposed extension together with the previous addition would result in inappropriate development, harmful to the openness and character of the Green Belt contrary to Policy G4 of the Unitary Development Plan regarding development, alterations or conversions in the Green Belt.

---

27. Application No: 07/00979/FULL1
Ward: Orpington
Address: Christ Church Charterhouse Road
Orpington Kent
Conservation Area: NO
OS Grid Ref: E: 546789 N: 164918
Applicant: The Parochial Church Council Of Christ Church Orpington
Objections: YES

Description of Development:

Replacement church hall, widening of existing vehicular access and associated car parking and landscaping works (Revision to permission 05/01047 to retain existing bank to north western boundary and provision of shrubs to western boundary)

Proposal

It is proposed to retain an existing grassed bank along the north western boundary of the site. In addition it is also proposed to plant shrubs on the west side of the bank to provide a screen between the church grounds and the nearby residential properties.

Consultations

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received from the resident at No.6 Goddington Chase whose rear boundary abut the application site. which can be summarised as follows:

- the highest part of the bank is only 0.5m below the top of the boundary fence at No.6 Goddington Chase and approx. 2.3m above the ground level of our garden
- the improved facilities at the church will result in increased use of the church hall and the construction of the bank allows uninterrupted views into our rear garden and loss of privacy
- loss of security
- most of the proposed landscaping would be too low to allay our concerns, the proposed trees and bamboo would not provide effective screening
the bank does not improve the appearance of the site and would be a hazard for young people as it constructed of grassed over spoil from building works with protruding bricks and stone.

Planning Considerations

Under planning ref. 05/01047 planning permission was granted for the replacement church hall, widening of existing vehicle crossover and associated parking and landscaping works. During the works to construct the church it was discovered that the soil under the ground floor slab was contaminated with asbestos cement fragments. The chosen method for safe disposal was to move the contaminated soil and bury it in a marked position below the grassed area to the north of the church hall. Rather than remove large amounts of subsoil from the site it was proposed to form a bank to the north boundary and north end of the west boundary of the site.

The applicant considers that the bank improves the appearance of the grassed area to the north of the church and church hall which was previously difficult to maintain and full of weeds and brambles. At present there is screen of trees and shrubs on the land to the north of the Christ Church Site, on the west boundary there is a 1.8m high close boarded fence but no trees or shrubs. In recognition of the fact that the bank has the potential to result in overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbouring residents it is proposed to plant shrubs on the west side of the bank by the west boundary, this would be in addition to an agreed scheme of planting for the west boundary alongside the car park approved under the previous application [ref. 05/01047].

The Rev’d Jay Colwill has also submitted a statement setting out a case for the retention of the bank, it reads as follows:

“I believe the bank is necessary and beneficial addition to the landscaping of the Christ Church Orpington site. The purpose of the bank is to allow the occasional teaching of the children through theatre and drama. The bank affords a seating area for children and adults on such occasions. It provides a visual focus to the church to the church grounds, which, before were featureless. The ground used to fall away towards the fence in a potentially dangerous way now that soil has been laid on both sides of the bank, the grounds are less undulating.”

Conclusions

The changes to the permitted scheme resulting in the formation of a bank at the rear of the site gives rise to direct overlooking to rear gardens particularly that at No.6 Goddington Chase, this would quite clearly result in a loss of privacy and would quite possibly spoil the quiet enjoyment of the rear garden. The main issue therefore is whether the scheme of planting proposed in addition to the scheme of landscaping approved under the previous applicant will be sufficient to provide effective screening to an extent that neighbouring residents are not unduly affected by this proposal.

The species of trees and shrubs chosen are of a hardy variety with mostly an average to fast growth rate and would provide a visually attractive mix of colours and textures. They would grow to maximum height of between 5 and 6 metres and spread between 3-5 metres. In addition smaller shrubs of lesser height are also proposed.
Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 07/00979 and 05/01047, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

1. The retention of the bank in the north and north west corner of the site is unduly harmful to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties by reason of overlooking and loss of privacy thereby contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

28. Application No : 07/01052/CAC
Ward : Bromley Common And Keston
Address : 53 Forest Drive Keston Kent BR2 6EE
Conservation Area: Keston Park
OS Grid Ref: E: 542369 N: 165035
Applicant : Paul Denby
Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing house
CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing house (Conservation Area Consent)

Proposal

This application needs to be considered together with 07/01069.

Consultations

No objections have been raised in respect of the demolition of the existing house and its impact on the Conservation Area. This proposal is dependent upon permission being given for 07/01069. The building in question is not considered to be of any architectural merit.

Conclusion
If Members are minded to refuse permission for ref. 07/01069 then refusal of consent would be appropriate in this instance.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 07/01069 and 07/01052, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

1. In the absence of a suitable replacement dwelling on this site, it would be premature to grant Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the existing dwelling, contrary to Policies BE11 and BE12 of the Unitary Development Plan.

29. Application No : 07/01069/FULL1  
   Ward : Bromley Common And Keston

   Address : 53 Forest Drive Keston Kent BR2 6EE  
   Conservation Area: Keston Park

   OS Grid Ref: E: 542369 N: 165035

   Applicant : PAUL DENBY  
   Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Erection of 5 bedroom dwellinghouse with integral granny annexe and double garage following demolition of existing dwellinghouse

Proposal

This application proposes the demolition of an existing detached 2 storey house and the erection of a replacement dwelling of modern design. The site is located in Keston Park Conservation Area, on the western side of Forest Drive. The land level in the vicinity falls away to the north. There is a mature oak tree to the front of the existing dwelling, which is shown to be retained by the proposed development.

The existing house is situated well back into the site with some 63m front garden length; the rear garden length is c 34m and the plot is c 54m wide.

The design and access statement submitted in support of the application highlights the variety in the house design types and use of materials within the estate. It states that the general approach to this proposal has been to design a detached family house of
exceptional architectural quality to enhance the estates typology of large, distinct, individual houses.

The agents state that the house has been designed to fit with its neighbours in terms of scale and mass and has been designed to take advantage of the wooded nature of the site by exploiting the connection with the landscape. It highlights that the proposed house is lower than the existing house as well as both its immediate neighbours.

Consultations

Local objections have been received to the proposal and are summarised below;

- overlooking
- design – out of keeping and would set a precedent
- concerns re the oak tree and the impact of the development

APCA raise no objections to the proposal subject to high quality materials and detailing to be approved and a comprehensive landscaping scheme to ensure a suitable setting for the scheme.

In respect of the tree a detailed plan has been requested showing the existing and proposed underground services; it is understood that in the event of a planning permission safeguarding conditions would be required to protect the well-being of the tree. Any additional comments from the tree officer will be reported verbally to committee.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be considered under the following policies from Bromley’s Unitary Development Plan: Policies H7, Housing Density and Design, BE1, Design of New Development, BE11, Conservation Areas NE7, Development and Trees and supplementary planning guidance (Appendix VIII) in the form of Keston Park Conservation Area Statement.

Policy H7 refers to new housing designed to a high quality and recognises as well as complements the qualities of the surrounding areas.

Policy BE1 expects for all development proposals to be of a high standard, imaginative and attractive to look at and to complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. It also states that the development should not detract from the existing street scene and/or landscape.

Policy BE11 requires for development in Conservation Areas to respect and incorporate in the design, existing landscape or other features that contribute to the character, appearance or historic value of the area and to respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces.

Policy NE7 states that when considering new development proposals the Council will seek the retention and the long term health and stability of as many trees as possible.

Supplementary planning guidance (SPG) for Keston Park states that the character of the Park is maintained by two components; a strong landscape framework and a very low development density. As a result, the houses sit within a dominant landscape
setting. Any new development proposal should demonstrate that it has taken good account of the existing landscape of the site and surroundings and incorporated as much as possible into a sympathetic new landscape treatment.

The original intention of the estate was for detached houses to be developed by individual purchasers, using the designs of their own architects. The guidance goes on to state that the construction of houses by individual architects on individual plots has resulted in a great diversity of materials and construction methods being employed and it is not possible to specify individual materials or construction methods that are completely typical of the area. However, houses have tended to be of traditional construction and employ materials that pay reference to building types of past ages.

The SPG advises that whilst the Arcadian estate that has resulted from this approach is similar to estates that were produced by developers within the Arts & Crafts or Garden City movements, it appears that it also paid reference to early 20th century suburban developments in the United States. Frederick Rogers had observed such estates whilst on a world tour in 1911. The development density is low mirroring the approach taken on the fringes of American cities. The landscape dominance and the individualistic lack of a common architectural theme within the estate are also far more characteristic of America than Britain.

The guidance states that the Council will wish to maintain buildings of diverse appearance in the Park.

**Conclusions**

As the existing dwelling is not considered to be of any particular architectural merit the principle of the demolition of the dwelling and its replacement is considered to be acceptable.

Given the acceptability of the principle, the main issues for consideration relate to the impact of the design on the street scene, the impact on the protected tree and the impact on the residential amenities of adjoining and nearby occupiers.

With regard the design, APCA raise no objections subject to high quality materials and a comprehensive landscaping scheme to ensure a suitable setting for the scheme. Local objections have been submitted which raise concerns that the modern design looks out of keeping within Keston Park. Whilst replacement houses on the Park have tended to be of traditional construction and employed materials that pay reference to building types of past ages it may be considered that the use of a modern design is in the spirit of the original intention of the Park for detached houses to be ‘…developed by individual purchasers, using the designs of their own architects’.

It is considered that the interpretation of such a modern design hinges on the appropriate use of quality materials. The submitted plans indicate the predominant use of white render, zinc roof finish and zinc panelled garage doors and vertical wood board detailing. The design requires a large proportion of glazing, particularly to the rear elevation. Careful consideration will need to be given to the extent of glazing and the use of the suggested materials given the relationship of the application site to the surrounding residential properties.
It is understood that subject to safeguarding conditions the development will not unduly affect the health of the oak tree; additional comments from the tree officer will be presented verbally to Committee.

When compared to the existing house the proposed dwelling will see an increase in side space from 1m to 2m to the northern boundary with a remaining 5 – 6m side space to the southern boundary and whilst it will come further forward into the site by some 5-6m to that existing, a considerable frontage remains. Whilst no objections have been raised by immediately adjoining neighbours, concerns are raised in respect of the depth of the development, some 12.5m, beyond no. 55, which is sited to the north of the application site and is at a considerably lower level. There is an element of natural screening to this boundary but the extent of the built development may be considered excessive.

In terms of its relationship to the adjacent property to the south (no. 51) the replacement dwelling will extend further across the site whilst still retaining c 5-6m separation from this boundary. It will be set further forward of that building line; at present there is a slightly staggered building line. It should be noted that no. 51 is at a higher level.

It is considered that this particular proposal falls to be considered on the impact on the adjacent residential amenities. However, Members may wish to give careful consideration to the design issues, which this particular proposal also raises.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 06/01861, 07/01069 and 07/01052, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 25.04.2007

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

1. The proposal would be overdominant and detrimental to the amenities that the occupiers of the adjoining properties might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy by reason of visual impact and loss of prospect in view of its size and depth of rearward projection and the extent of glazing proposed by the design, contrary to Policies H7, BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan.