

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 20 March 2014

Present:

Councillor Charles Joel (Chairman)
Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Reg Adams, Kathy Bance MBE, Julian Grainger,
John Ince, Russell Jackson, Kate Lymer and Richard Scoates

Also Present:

Councillors Russell Mellor, Alexa Michael, Sarah Phillips and
Colin Smith

28 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Simon Fawthrop; Councillor John Ince attended as substitute.

Councillor Russell Jackson apologised for his early departure from the meeting.

29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Jackson declared a personal interest in Item 4.1 (Minute 31.1) as he was a Governor of Warren Road Primary School.

Councillor Adams declared a personal interest in Item 4.2 (Minute 31.2) as he and Father Paul Keown, Vicar of St Michael and All Angels Church, were Governors at Stuart Fleming Primary School.

Councillor Ince declared a personal interest in Item 4.9 (Minute 31.9) as he was well acquainted with an objector to the application.

All Members declared a personal interest in Item 4.17 (Minute 31.17) as the applicant was known to them.

30 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 23 JANUARY 2014

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 January 2014 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

31 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 1

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

31.1 CHELSFIELD AND PRATTS BOTTOM

**(13/04165/REG3) - Warren Road Primary School,
Warren Road, Orpington**

Description of application - Detached timber framed classroom building.

An objection concerning the location of the path from the existing school building was received from Sport England. It was suggested that the path be relocated and a revised plan be submitted.

Members having considered the report and objection, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO AGREEMENT WITH SPORT ENGLAND** and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

A further informative was included to read:-

3 The applicant is advised that the inclusion of a green roof in the proposed development would be welcomed.

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

31.2 CLOCK HOUSE

**(13/03082/FULL1) - St Michael and All Angels
Church, Ravenscroft Road, Beckenham**

Description of application - Demolition of church hall, reconfiguration of access to the church of St Michaels and All Angels with new glazed screen and improved access ramp together with the erection of a terrace of 4 dwellings fronting Birkbeck Road and a pair of 4 bedroom dwellings fronting Ravenscroft Road with associated car parking spaces and cycle space.

Oral representations in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Sarah Phillips in support of the application were received at the meeting.

It was reported that further objections to the application had been received.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the

Chief Planner with the addition of a further two conditions to read:-

10 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied boundary enclosures of a height and type to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be erected in such positions along the boundaries of the site(s) as shall be approved and shall be permanently retained thereafter.

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

11 Before any part of the development hereby permitted is first occupied, bicycle parking (including covered storage facilities where appropriate) shall be provided at the site in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the bicycle parking/storage facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy T7 and Appendix II.7 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at the site in the interest of reducing reliance on private car transport.

**31.3
BROMLEY COMMON AND
KESTON
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(13/03655/FULL1) - Rivenhall, Holwood Park
Avenue, Orpington**

Description of application - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two detached houses.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Alexa Michael in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

Comments from Ward Member Councillor Stephen Carr in support of the application were reported.

Comments from the Tree Officer were also reported. Paragraph 5 on page 30 of the report was amended to read:- 'It is also noted that the Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas does *not* have any objections to the proposal with regard to its layout or conservation and design matters.'

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the

Chief Planner with the addition of a further three conditions to read:-

14 No demolition of buildings shall take place until a survey has been carried out to ascertain if any bats are roosting in the buildings concerned. If any bats are discovered, details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority of the timing of the works and any necessary mitigation measures. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved timing and mitigation measures.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy NE3 of the Unitary Development Plan and in order to safeguard the interests and well-being of bats on the site which are specifically protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended).

15 If any trees are felled in order to implement the development hereby permitted, trees of a size and species to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be planted as replacements in such positions as shall be agreed by the Authority in the first planting season following completion of the development. Any trees which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally planted.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy NE8 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development.

16 Notwithstanding those details submitted with the application, details of surface water drainage proposals and the impact of the development, especially basements, on the drainage of the site and vicinity shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and implemented before first occupation of the dwellings.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory implementation of the surface water drainage proposals and to accord with Policy ER13 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**31.4
COPERS COPE**

(13/03853/FULL2) - Junction House, 4-6 Southend Road, Beckenham

Description of application - Change of use from use class B1a office to use class D1 nursery.

Oral representations in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Russell Mellor in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

It was reported that further objections to the application had been received.

Members noted that the planning officer's recommendation on page 40 of the report, had been amended to read 'permission'.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1 The proposal does not include suitable parking and dropping off facilities for the nursery which would be likely to lead to indiscriminate parking and unsafe conditions in the highway in the proximity of the site, contrary to Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2 No evidence has been provided of long term vacancy despite marketing of the premises or to demonstrate that there is no local shortage of office floorspace. Nor has any evidence been provided to show that the size, configuration, access arrangements or other characteristics make it unsuitable for Classes B1, B2 or B8 use, or that full and proper marketing of the site confirms the unsuitability and financial non-viability of the site or premises for those uses or that there is no likely loss of employment resulting from the proposal. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies EMP3 and EMP5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

31.5 PENGE AND CATOR

(13/04218/FULL1) - 2A Kingswood Road, Penge

Description of application - Demolition of existing industrial building and ancillary offices and erection of a two storey building providing four 2 bedroom flats with associated landscaping, parking, cycle and bin storage.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting.

It was reported that further objections to the application had been received. It was also reported that further comments in support of the application had been received.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION**

BE GRANTED as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner.
Councillor Grainger's vote against permission was noted.

**31.6
DARWIN**

(13/04248/FULL6) - Two Ways, Viewlands Avenue, Westerham

Description of application - Roof alterations to provide habitable accommodation with roofspace, conversion of existing garage to habitable room, erection of chimney to side, elevational alterations and detached double garage/gym/store to rear.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reasons set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**31.7
BICKLEY**

(13/04288/FULL6) - 16 Falcon Avenue, Bickley

Description of application - First floor side/rear extension.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that the application BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1 The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirement for a minimum 1 metre side space to be maintained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the dwelling and the flank boundary required, in respect of two-storey development and, in the absence of such a separation, 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 Policies H9 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**31.8
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

(13/04292/FULL1) - 11 Alexander Close, Hayes

Description of application - Conversion of existing dwelling to two 3 bedroom terraced dwellings.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

Comments from Ward Member Councillor Mrs Anne Manning were reported at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1 The proposed development would result in an unsatisfactory change to the character and appearance of the dwellings and the street, by reason of the terracing effect caused by the elevational changes necessary to create an additional dwelling, excessive hardstanding and car parking, and consequential lack of soft landscaping, therefore contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**31.9
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(14/00249/FULL6) - 4 Little Thrift, Petts Wood

Description of application - Two storey side/rear extension and increase in roof height to incorporate rear dormer and extension to existing garage roof.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Comments from Ward Member Councillor Simon Fawthrop in objection to the application were reported at the meeting (attached as Appendix A).

It was reported that further objections to the application had been received.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the**

application BE REFUSED for the following reasons:-

1 The proposal, by reason of its excessive scale, size and layout, would be out of character with surrounding development and harmful to the spatial standards and character and appearance of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character, and contrary to policies BE1, H8, H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2 The proposed extension would adversely affect the amenities associated with the neighbouring properties either side, by reason of loss of light, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**31.10
CLOCK HOUSE**

**(14/00449/RESPA) - County House,
221-241 Beckenham Road, Beckenham**

Description of application - Change of use of ground, first, second, third, fourth and fifth floors from Class B1(a) office to Class C3 dwellinghouses to form 65 one bedroom and 10 two bedroom flats (56 day application to prior approval in respect of transport, contamination and flooding risks under Class J Part 3 of the GPDO).

Oral representations in objection to the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Sarah Phillips were received at the meeting.

Comments from the Highways Division were reported. Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PRIOR APPROVAL WAS REQUIRED AND REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1 The transport and highways impacts of the development are considered to be unsatisfactory with particular regard to the impact of the number of dwellings proposed on local transport infrastructure, uncertainty regarding delivery and retention of the proposed car parking, including the accessibility and overall number of spaces, and the potential for dangerous manoeuvres within the adjacent public highway.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

**31.11
PLAISTOW AND
SUNDRIDGE**

(13/02568/FULL1) - 10 Aldermay Road, Bromley

Description of application - Hip to gable loft extension, insertion of rear dormer windows and conversion of loft space to increase size of existing fourth unit from 1 bedroom to 2 bedroom flat (4 units in total).

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report of the Chief Planner with the addition of a further condition to read:-

5 Notwithstanding those details submitted with the application before development commences, large scale plans of the dormers on a 1:20 scale shall be

submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and installed in accordance with those details.

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

**31.12
PLAISTOW AND
SUNDRIDGE**

(13/03404/FULL1) - 12 Aldermary Road, Bromley

Description of application - Roof extensions, single storey rear extension and alterations to provide a one bedroom flat on the upper floor together with a two bedroom flat on both the ground and first floors (3 units in total).

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report of the Chief Planner with the addition of a further condition to read:-

5 Notwithstanding those details submitted with the application before development commences, large scale plans of the dormers on a 1:20 scale shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and installed in accordance with those details.

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

**31.13
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

(13/03970/FULL1) - The Bickley Arms, Chislehurst Road, Chislehurst

Description of application - Single storey side extension and raised terrace, detached barbecue hut and beach hut in rear garden, with landscaping including raised decking and planters.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

It was reported that all three Ward Members were in support of the application.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION**

BE GRANTED as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with the addition of a further condition to read:-

4 Prior to commencement of the development hereby permitted, a management plan for the outside areas shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plans shall include but not be limited to, information regarding measures to control smoke and odours from the proposed barbeque and to reduce any other harmful impacts of the use of this area on the adjacent residential properties. Measures agreed in the plan shall be implemented in accordance with any agreed timescale and shall be permanently maintained unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of adjacent residential properties and to accord with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**31.14
BIGGIN HILL**

(13/04199/FULL1) - 39 Church Road, Biggin Hill

Description of application - Erection of detached two bedroom single storey dwelling with associated landscaping and parking on land rear of 39 Church Road.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

It was reported that the site map on page 103 of the report was incorrect in that the application site was actually located two properties to the right of the property outlined.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**31.15
BICKLEY**

(13/04243/FULL6) - Greenwood, Bickley Park Road, Bickley

Description of application - Single storey side/rear extension and outbuilding to rear for use as gym/play/store.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

As Ward Member for Bickley, Councillor Lymer spoke in objection to the application (attached as Appendix B).

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1 The proposed extension and outbuilding by reason of their location, size and design and the cumulative impact along with previous development at the site would constitute an overdevelopment of the site, harmful to spatial standards and the character and appearance of the Bickley Park Area of Special Residential Character, contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**31.16
CLOCK HOUSE**

(14/00395/FULL6) - Glenwood, Blakeney Road, Beckenham

Description of application - Glenwood: Part one/two storey rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable room with bay window to front and new tiled roof over existing lean-to extension.

Maune: First floor rear extension, porch to side, bay window to front and elevational alterations.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that the application BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1 The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirement for a minimum 1 metre side space to be maintained for the full height and length of the flank wall of the dwelling and the flank boundary required, in respect of two-storey development and, in the absence of such a separation, 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 Policies H9 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2 The proposal would adversely affect the residential amenities of neighbouring flats at No 1 Blakeney Road, by reason of loss of light and prospect and overlooking and loss of privacy, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

31.17
ORPINGTON

(14/00401/PLUD) - 95 Kynaston Road, Orpington

Description of application - Single storey rear extension, rear dormer and hip to gable end roof alterations CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.

The Planning Officer informed Members that as the proposed single storey rear extension would not constitute permitted development, a Certificate of Lawfulness could not be granted for this particular aspect of the application. He therefore suggested that, if minded to do so, Members could make a split decision.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that A SPLIT DECISION BE ISSUED** as outlined out below:

A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS BE REFUSED IN RESPECT OF THE SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION for the following reason:-

1. The proposed single storey rear extension would not constitute permitted development as it would not comply with section A.1(h)(iii) of Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended).

A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS BE GRANTED in respect of the proposed roof extensions and alterations as this constitutes permitted development under Part 1, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended).

31.18
SHORTLANDS

(14/00459/FULL6) - 48 Elwill Way, Beckenham

Description of application - Two storey side and rear extensions, alterations to roof including rear dormer, Juliet balconies, front porch, alterations to existing garage, alterations to fenestration.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

The Planning Officer advised Members that the references to the 'Park Langley Area of Special Residential Character Design Guide' and the 'PLRA Design Guide' on pages 120 and 121 of the report were not related to any planning policy or guidance

but taken from guidance produced by the Park Langley Residents Association which carried very limited planning weight.

It was also reported that the sidespace reference of 1m in the penultimate paragraph on page 121 should actually refer to a gap between the two storey development and the site boundary to the west of between approximately 1.2m and 1.6m and to the east of approximately 1.9m.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

SECTION 4

(Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

31.19 BROMLEY TOWN

(13/04036/VAR) - 61 High Street, Bromley

Description of application - Variation of condition 2 and condition 4 of permission reference 11/02648/FULL2 to allow unrestricted A2 use and to amend opening hours.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE REFUSED** for the reasons set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

The meeting ended at 10.15 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

Minute Annex

APPENDIX A

ITEM 4.9 (MINUTE 31.9) - 4 LITTLE THRIFT, PETTS WOOD, ORPINGTON - REPORTED COMMENTS FROM WARD MEMBER COUNCILLOR SIMON FAWTHROP

I have already given my apologies for the meeting on 20th March but hope that you will give due consideration to my submission which is supported by Councillors Auld and Owen.

I have visited and spoken to the residents, of nos. 3, 4, 4a and 5 Little Thrift and viewed the property from all angles and aspects, both front and rear. The applicants advised me that they had consulted the objectors on this application, however this was denied by the objectors. The objectors advised that they would be happy for the application to be deferred so that discussions could take place with them and the applicant. The applicant indicated that they were not interested in a deferral, though did indicate they would be willing to accept that Permitted Development Rights should be removed if the application was to be granted.

Little Thrift sits at the heart of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). The Gardens have TPOs and in many cases are defined as Green Belt.

When the estate was laid out by the developer Basil Scruby, he planned out the roads, utilities and plot sizes imposing strict guidelines on materials to be used, density and design to meet his vision of a high class suburb emulating the garden suburb movement and it is this heritage which the ASRC designation seeks to conserve for future generations. The residents of Little Thrift have aspirations to enhance the area further by seeking Conservation Area Status.

Many of these references are contained within the ASRC policy H10 which refers specifically in paragraph 4.49 to protect against unsympathetic development which would threaten the established character and residential amenity. These standards are set out in Appendix I of the UDP.

In particular paragraph 1.1 (ii) says the properties should have the same readily identifiable characteristics, high spatial standards and well landscaped frontages. Paragraph 1.2 (i) states that developments likely to erode the quality and character of the ASRC shall be resisted. And (ii) residential density shall accord with that existing in the area. (vii) new development will be expected to take account of existing front and rear building lines. On page 67 of the committee report you will notice that this development projects 3.8 metres beyond the rear building line in contravention of this ASRC policy.

Looking at the impact upon the neighbours the key elements of the report are listed on page 69, where in the second paragraph it quite clearly states that the bulk and scale of the development would be significant. In the third paragraph on page 69 the report states that the impact on no. 4a (Flank window) would be acceptable for properties that are separated by at least 2 metres. In this instance the separation between No.4 and no.4a will be about 1 metre which is not acceptable. The report also recognises that there will be

an impact on no.4a's kitchen dining area. The report says that this would not be sufficient to warrant refusal, but it does have an impact on the residential amenity of no. 4a.

The impact on no. 3 is starker as the building will directly block the light to their lounge which is considered a habitable room. Whilst this is two storeys and stepped back it is clear from the report that the impact is one of balance. However I understand that the planning officer did not visit no. 3 to establish the impact on this habitable room. Having visited this property and seen for myself on a glorious sunny day the room, it is clear to me that the room is already dimly lit by natural sunlight and the reduction that would come about by the proposed extension would adversely impact the residential amenity of no.3.

Finally we have to look at the impact of the development on the ASRC as seen from the front of the street scene. The proposal would have an impact upon the ASRC street scene by narrowing the view beyond the houses and blocking out the greenery that can be seen throughout the spring and summer months which is one of the major contributing factors in the Petts Wood ASRC.

So to summarise: given that the applicant is unwilling to defer the application to enter into reasonable discussions with their neighbours. I would urge members to refuse this application on the following grounds:-

- i) The scale, size and layout is not compatible with development in the surrounding area. Policy H8 (i).
- ii) H10 Area of Special Residential Character, the development will erode special standards in the ASRC 1.1 (ii) and 1.2 (vii). The development does not take into account the existing rear building lines and 1.2 (ii) does not accord with the residential density in Little Thrift and taken from the street scene erodes the aspect of the ASRC by reducing the visibility of mature trees and greenery as seen from the street.
- iii) BE 1 (iv) and (v) In that it impacts upon the residential amenity of nos. 3 and 4a and impacts upon the daylight on the habitable room of no.3. Little Thrift in particular.
- iv) H9 Side space the proposed extension between nos. 4 and 4a does not step back by a minimum of 1M meaning there is insufficient side space from the rear of the existing building line at no.4 Little Thrift.

Should members not be minded to refuse permission then if permission is granted can the condition removing PD rights be attached to the application.

Simon Fawthrop
Councillor for Petts Wood & Knoll Ward
London Borough of Bromley

Minute Annex

APPENDIX B

ITEM 4.15 (MINUTE 31.15) - GREENWOOD, BICKLEY PARK ROAD, BICKLEY - REPORTED COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBER AND WARD COUNCILLOR KATE LYMER

This house is already too big. This is the 10th planning application on this site. The last application you will recall came to this Committee last September when the applicant wanted to enlarge the house to change the use from a dwelling house to a larger house of multiple occupation for African Missionaries.

This application comprises of two parts, the large extension to the house and the proposed building of an outbuilding.

Firstly the extension. Greenwood is situated in the Bickley Park area of special residential character. Our UDP states that applications in an ASRC should be in accord with residential density, spatial standards, height etc with the standards set in the area. Greenwood is already much larger, bulkier, higher and more dominant than the neighbouring properties on either side of it. It already looks out of kilter with the homes in it's vicinity. The single storey extension is proposed to run along the whole left hand side of the building and along the entire length of the back of the house. This extension equates to a massive 74% increase in ground floor space, on an already large house. This would be out of character with the spatial standards of the ASRC and an overdevelopment of the site.

During its planning history, 3 of the previous 12 applications were proposing to building another house in the back garden. In this application they instead propose to build an outbuilding at the rear. The stated use of this outbuilding is to be a playroom, or perhaps a gym, or they suggest it could be a store room. The fact that there is no specified use for this outbuilding points to the fact that there is no real need for this building.

Regardless of the fact that this is proposed to be built in a large garden, the proportions of this outbuilding are huge. Much larger than your average shed. This outbuilding is proposed to be 11m by 7m. This is the size of a barn, but without the farm to match it. This outbuilding is so big that it is larger than the existing rear reception room inside the house, which measures less than half the size at only 5.8m x 5.1m. Therefore this proposed building is backland development. In our UDP it states that backland development is not allowed in an Area of Special Residential Character.

In conclusion, the proposed development will be too big compared to adjoining properties thus ruining the character of the ASRC. Furthermore the front appearance will be larger than the adjacent houses. Plot width, garden depth and plot ratio will change dramatically and will not fit to the area, and the proposed development will certainly alter the external appearance in such a way that it will not fit in the ASRC. There is little doubt that if this extension is allowed a further application is likely to soon follow to build on top of it.

I propose that this application is refused on the following grounds:

- Detrimental impact on the character and spatial standards of Bickley Park Area of Special Residential Character due to its size and bulk
- It is out of character with the houses in the vicinity
- Both the extension and the outbuilding are an overdevelopment of the site as both are excessive in size
- And in my opinion the outbuilding is backland development

These are all contrary to policies H10, BE1 and H8.