



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BRI 3UH

TELEPHONE: 020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Rosalind Upperton
Rosalind.Upperton@bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE: 020 8313 4745

FAX: 020 8290 0608

DATE: 9 June 2015

To: Members of the
PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 3

Councillor Katy Boughey (Chairman)
Councillor Douglas Auld (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kevin Brooks, Alan Collins, Nicky Dykes, William Huntington-Thresher,
Charles Joel, Alexa Michael and Stephen Wells

A meeting of the Plans Sub-Committee No. 3 will be held at Bromley Civic Centre on
THURSDAY 18 JUNE 2015 AT 7.00 PM

MARK BOWEN
Director of Corporate Services

Members of the public can speak at Plans Sub-Committee meetings on planning reports, contravention reports or tree preservation orders. To do so, you must have

- already written to the Council expressing your view on the particular matter, and
- indicated your wish to speak by contacting the Democratic Services team by no later than 10.00am on the working day before the date of the meeting.

These public contributions will be at the discretion of the Chairman. They will normally be limited to two speakers per proposal (one for and one against), each with three minutes to put their view across.

To register to speak please telephone Democratic Services on 020 8313 4745

If you have further enquiries or need further information on the content of any of the applications being considered at this meeting, please contact our Planning Division on 020 8313 4956 or e-mail planning@bromley.gov.uk

Information on the outline decisions taken will usually be available on our website (see below) within a day of the meeting.

Copies of the documents referred to below can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

A G E N D A

- 1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**
- 2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
- 3 **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 16 APRIL 2015**
(Pages 1 - 4)
- 4 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

SECTION 1 (Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
NO REPORTS			

SECTION 2 (Applications meriting special consideration)

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
4.1	Plaistow and Sundridge	5 - 14	(14/03125/FULL2) - 1 Edward Road Bromley.
4.2	Bromley Common and Keston		(15/00802/FULL1) - Potters Farm, Turpington Lane, Bromley. (REPORT TO FOLLOW)
4.3	Copers Cope	15 - 26	15/01044/FULL1) - Tudor Manor, Beckenham Place Park, Beckenham.
4.4	Bickley Conservation Area	27 - 30	(15/01173/DEMCON) - 107 Plaistow Lane, Bromley.
4.5	Crystal Palace	31 - 36	(15/01267/FULL6) - 59 Anerley Park, Penge.
4.6	West Wickham	37 - 42	(15/01327/FULL6) - 1 The Crescent, West Wickham.
4.7	Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom		(15/01533/ELUD) - Woodhill Farm, Norsted Lane, Orpington. (REPORT TO FOLLOW)

SECTION 3 (Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
4.8	Bickley	43 - 46	(15/01049/FULL1) - St Georges School, Tylney Road, Bromley.
4.9	West Wickham	47 - 52	(15/01088/FULL6) - 11 Boleyn Gardens, West Wickham.
4.10	Bickley	53 - 58	(15/01265/FULL1) - 5 Wells Road, Bickley.
4.11	Petts Wood and Knoll	59 - 66	(15/01312/FULL1) - 6 Ladywood Avenue, Petts Wood.
4.12	Cray Valley West	67 - 70	(15/01431/FULL6) - 197 Leasons Hill, Orpington.

SECTION 4 (Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
4.13	Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	71 - 76	(15/00864/FULL1) - Cookham Farm, Skeet Hill Lane, Orpington.
4.14	Cray Valley East	77 - 80	(15/01911/TELCOM) - Land Opposite 27-33 Chelsfield Road, Orpington.

5 CONTRAVENTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
	NO REPORTS		

6 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

Report No.	Ward	Page No.	Application Number and Address
	NO REPORTS		

This page is left intentionally blank

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 3

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 16 April 2015

Present:

Councillor Katy Boughey (Chairman)
Councillor Douglas Auld (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Teresa Ball, Kevin Brooks, Lydia Buttinger,
Mary Cooke, Charles Joel and Alexa Michael

Also Present:

Councillor Keith Onslow

28 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP and Councillor Mary Cooke attended as his substitute.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Ellie Harmer.

29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Prior to this meeting, an Urgency Committee was convened on Wednesday, 15 April 2015, to consider a dispensation request from Councillor Keith Onslow to permit him to address Members on Item 4.5 (15/00845/FULL6) – 114 St John's Road, Petts Wood, in which he had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest as the owner of the property. An unconditional dispensation was granted and Councillor Onslow spoke as a member of the public but did not take part in the discussion or vote.

Councillor Douglas Auld declared a personal interest in Item 4.5 as he was acquainted with the applicant and left the Chamber for this item.

30 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 19 FEBRUARY 2015

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 February 2015 be confirmed.

31 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 1

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

31.1 CRAY VALLEY WEST

**(14/04856/FULL1) - Midfield Primary School,
Grovelands Road, Orpington.**

Description of application – Demolition of existing single storey section and construction of a single storey extension to provide 2 classrooms with

associated landscaping and elevational alterations to existing building to facilitate 60 additional pupils.

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

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

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

31.2 FARNBOROUGH AND CROFTON

(14/03509/FULL1) - 132 Crofton Road, Orpington.

Description of application – Alteration, extension and conversion of existing dwellinghouse to form 4 two bedroom flats and the construction of a pair of semi-detached houses, together with the formation of private and communal gardens, the construction of bin and cycle stores and closing the existing vehicular access from Crofton Road.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED to CONTEST the APPEAL** on the following grounds:-

“1. The proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, and the privacy and amenity of neighbouring bungalow occupiers, contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and paragraphs 56 and 57 of the NPPF, in particular by reason of the number and layout of dwellings proposed, the excessive amount of site coverage, the limited scope for new landscaping and the retention of existing vegetation due to the proximity of buildings and hardstanding to the site boundaries, and the opening up of the site to view from the surrounding area.

2. The proposed development would result in an increase in vehicular movements to and from the site in close proximity to the junction of Crofton Lane and Crofton Road, which would result in traffic congestion and harm to road safety, contrary to Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

**31.3
CHELSFIELD AND PRATTS
BOTTOM**

(15/00101/FULL1) - Bow Wood, Stonehouse Road, Orpington.

Description of application – Proposed new dwelling.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that the application site was adjacent to the Green Belt. Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED**, without prejudice to any future consideration to, seek a reduction in the height of the roof ridge, to set the building back to the building line and to reduce the impact on Whitecroft.

**31.4
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

(15/00560/FULL6) - 38 Ridgeway, Hayes.

Description of application - Part one/two storey side and single storey rear extensions.

It was reported that on page 43 of the Chief Planner's report, second paragraph, the word 'ground' in the fifth line should be amended to read, 'floor'.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions 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 an amendment to Condition 5 to read:-

"5. Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed window in the first floor western flank elevation shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of privacy level 3 and non-opening, and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such."

**31.5
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(15/00845/FULL6) - 114 St John's Road, Petts Wood.

Description of application – Single storey front extension.

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

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

GRANTED as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

32

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

The Chairman moved that the attached report, not included in the published agenda, be considered as a matter of urgency on the following grounds:- “In order that the application is considered within the 8 week statutory timescale.”

**32.1
BROMLEY TOWN**

(14/04868/FULL1) - Central Library, High Street, Bromley

Description of application – Installation of a new chilled water plant.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

The Meeting ended at 7.41 pm

Chairman

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 14/03125/FULL2

Ward:
Plaistow And Sundridge

Address : 1 Edward Road Bromley BR1 3NG

OS Grid Ref: E: 540891 N: 170303

Applicant : Mrs F Antonio

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Change of use from house in multiple occupation (HMO)(used by 6 unrelated persons) to a day Nursery (Class D1) for a maximum number of 36 children with associated car parking spaces, refuse storage, cycle parking and 2m high front boundary wall and railings.

Key designations:

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

Proposal

- It is proposed to convert the existing ground and first floors to a Children's Day Nursery (Use Class D1)
- The second floor is to remain as a residential unit for use by members of staff
- to the rear of the site landscaping and a 2.5m high acoustic absorptive barrier is proposed around the garden boundary, the acoustic fencing would be of a timber construction however no elevations have been provided
- the nursery would cater for a maximum of 36 children, aged up to 5 years
- up to 7 staff are anticipated
- the proposed opening hours are between 07:30 - 18:30 Monday to Fridays, with drop-off and collection times between 07:45 and 18:00
- 1 additional vehicular access is proposed resulting in 2 vehicle accesses at the front to create a separate entrance and exit for pick-up and drop-offs
- 2 off-street car parking spaces including 1 disabled bay are also proposed
- secured cycle parking facilities will be provided for 4 cycles
- parking/storage for buggies will be provided within the building
- pedestrian access is as existing through the front door
- a 2m high front boundary wall with railings and boundary columns are proposed with bin storage immediately behind.

The following additional/revised information has been received:

- Technical parking and transport note (21/01/2015)
- Transport statement (21/01/2015)
- Swept path analysis (21/01/2015)
- Revised acoustic testing report and details of acoustic fence (19/02/2015)
- Second floor plans (existing and proposed) (02/04/2015)
- Supporting email from Agent (02/04/2015)
- Revised second floor plan showing residential unit retained (22/05/2015)
- Supporting statement (03/06/2015)

Location

- the application site consists of a two storey with accommodation in the roof detached building which has been deemed to have a lawful use as an House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) falling within Class C4, for not more than six residents
- the surrounding area is predominantly residential in character consisting of large detached houses with large rear gardens
- some buildings in the surrounding area have been converted into flats and others are used as residential institutions
- the application site lies just north of the junction of Edward Road with Plaistow Lane which is a Local Distributor Road
- there is currently 1 vehicular access
- the site is not within a Conservation Area although the land immediately to e site forms part of the Sundridge Avenue conservation area which then extends out to cover the area to the north-west
- immediately adjacent the site to the north-east is 3 Edward Road, a single dwellinghouse
- Immediately to the south-west is 1a Edward Road, also used as a single dwelling
- The site has a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 2

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

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

- insufficient parking for customers, delivery staff, etc
- road cannot handle more cars, delivery lorries, noise, refuse, etc
- parking problems already in road
- no need for a nursery in the area, there are 7 others
- 36 children will make a significant amount of noise
- Street was designed as a residential street and should remain that way
- School children cross Edward Road junction
- No safe provision for parking or dropping off
- Parking problems made worse by lack of yellow lines
- Would aggravate traffic and parking problems

- In breach of covenants of the Scotts Estate
- Should revert to a family home
- Will affect peace and tranquillity of local residents
- Noise from back garden will interrupt enjoyment from own garden
- Fence abutting rear would affect outlook and would deflect noise upwards
- Disruptive to neighbouring residents
- Over-intensive use of property
- There are 21 other nurseries in BR1 area
- Any external signs or posters would further erode residential character of area
- Front garden area too small to provide car parking, cycle store and drop-off point safely
- Staff numbers too low to run an orderly day nursery
- How is it to be funded?
- Is it part of an existing group?
- How will it be regulated?
- Lack of suitable fire escape
- Access arrangements will not reduce likely congestion
- Where are the "associated parking spaces"?
- People living in this part of road are mainly retired and at their properties more during the day
- Fence not likely to be attractive to neighbours on either side
- Not clear whether maximum of 36 children relates to occupancy at any one time or in any one day
- Size of swept drive impractical
- Parking survey does not reflect true situation
- Edward road not a cul-de-sac
- Can residential and nursery activities co-exist
- Cars will be queuing to enter and exit
- Parked cars fully occupy adjacent roadside at all times of peak activity
- Fence too high for a domestic setting
- Turn from Edward Road to Plaistow Lane is a blind bend
- No cyclist will park bicycle 5 minutes' walk from destination
- Plaistow Lane not a cycling route
- Not adequately accessible by bicycle
- Transport statement is dated April 2014 and thus a year old and contains a lot of inaccuracies
- Acoustic testing report was carried out during winter months, figures may be different in summer months when children play outside more
- Unacceptably high additional levels of traffic flow and congestion
- Unreasonable reduction in road safety affecting vehicles and pedestrians.

Comments from Consultees

The Council's Highways Development Engineers have considered the revised transport information submitted and have raised no objections to the proposal.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer has considered the revised noise report and has raised no objections.

The Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor states there is a lack of detail with regard to how secured by design standards will be incorporated into the design of the development. A 'Secured by Design' condition is therefore recommended should permission be given so that the development achieves full SBD accreditation.

Education and Childcare Services have stated that:

The Sufficiency Report that is being referred to is dated 2011 so the information is out of date and there is not a current report available (to show the need for nursery places in this area). However in the last 12-18 months there have been 3 successful planning applications in the immediate vicinity two of which are open and offering up to 102 full-time childcare places. There will be an additional 60 places available in the third premises which will form part of an existing registered day nursery with an OfSTED 'Outstanding' rating.

This is not an area of the borough where the Council is seeking to develop 2 year old government funded places.

With reference to the Applicant's statement that there is 'inadequate provision for special needs nurseries in Bromley' it is expected that all settings should be inclusive and make their accommodation available to all children regardless of their Special Educational Need (SEN) or disability. (Ref; EYFS 3.67 Providers must have arrangements in place to support children with SEN or disabilities). There are two established childcare settings in the borough that provide care for children with complex special needs.

As part of their business plan the client may have identified a need for places in the area and it would be their decision, if planning permission was granted to open another childcare setting. OfSTED would carry out the registration process and Early Years would work with the setting to support quality and the delivery of the Early Years Foundation Stage.

Planning Considerations

Planning Considerations

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

- BE1 Design of New Development
- BE7 Railings, Boundary Walls and Other Means of Enclosure
- C1 Community Facilities
- C7 Educational and Pre-School Facilities
- EMP8 Use of Dwellings for Business Purposes
- H1 Housing Supply
- T1 Transport Demand
- T2 Assessment of Transport Effects
- T3 Parking
- T5 Access for People with Restricted Mobility

T6 Pedestrians
T7 Cyclists
T9 Public Transport
T10 Public Transport
T15 Traffic Management
T17 Servicing of Premises
T18 Road Safety

London Plan (March 2015):

3.14 Existing housing
3.16 Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure
3.18 Education Facilities
6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
6.9 Cycling
6.13 Parking
7.3 Designing Out Crime
7.15 Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate Soundscapes

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Planning History

There is a long and extensive planning history relating to the site. The more recent cases are summarised below:

- In 2011 under ref.10/02755 a single storey rear extension and change of use to Class C2 (residential institution) comprising mother and baby living accommodation with various shared facilities and ancillary office/staff accommodation was refused planning permission. The application was subsequently dismissed at Appeal.
- An Enforcement Notice was issued on 9th May 2011 in respect of the change of use to Class C2 and an Appeal against the notice was dismissed.
- In 2011 under ref.11/02415 planning permission was refused retrospectively for use as house in multiple occupation (HMO) including 3 rooms on top floor for mother and baby occupation.
- A further enforcement notice was issued in respect of the unauthorised change of use of the dwelling to a HMO for up to 16 people on 2nd Feb 2012. The notice was appealed and was allowed on the terms that the use as an HMO was lawful provided no more than 6 residents were in occupation, giving the remainder of the tenants 6 months to find alternative accommodation (decision date 12th September 2012).
- In 2012 under ref.12/00833 a certificate of lawfulness for an existing use for the use of the building as a house in multiple occupation by 6 unrelated individuals was refused. The decision was upheld at Appeal based on there

being more than 6 individuals residing at the premises (decision date 17th April 2013).

- In 2013 under ref.12/03319 planning permission was refused for the change of use to a house in multiple occupation (sui generis) for not more than 12 persons in 8 households. A subsequent appeal was dismissed.

- In 2014 under ref.14/00104 a certificate of lawful development deemed the Use of 1 Edward Road as 6 residential units for unrelated individuals as a lawful use of the site.

Conclusions

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding premises, the effect it would have on housing supply in the Borough and the impact it would have on highways safety and parking in the area.

The application site has a lawful use as an HMO for not more than six residents and is currently occupied. This use was deemed lawful in 2014 however prior to this there has been a long and complex planning history relating to the uses of the site. There have also been numerous complaints about the site to the Council's Environmental Health department relating to noise, disturbance and fly-tipping.

Policy H1 of the UDP resists the loss of housing through redevelopment or change of use, except where accommodation is unsuitable and incapable of being adapted for continued residential use or where the proposal meets an identified need for community facilities. The London Plan, at policy 3.14 also resists the loss of housing, including affordable. Also of relevance is policy EMP8 of the UDP which says that the Council will normally permit the use, by the householder, of part of a dwelling for business purposes only where the business use is secondary to the primary residential use of the property.

As part of the development proposal the second floor would be retained as a 2 bedroom residential unit for staff accommodation. The applicant says in their supporting statement that "Staff working late at night or early in the morning or on duty will be accommodated on the second floor".

A number of planning applications for childcare settings have recently been approved in the vicinity, two of which are open and offering up to 102 full-time childcare places. There will be an additional 60 places available when a third premises opens. As such there is not considered to be an identified need for such a community facility as is proposed. In light of the above, the proposal would be in breach of policy H1 of the UDP. However, as a residential element would be retained as staff accommodation, Members may consider that, on balance, the proposal would not have a significantly detrimental effect on the Borough's housing supply.

Furthermore, in support of their proposal, the applicant argues that there is inadequate provision for special needs nurseries in the Borough and the proposed use would help to address this inadequacy. While the Council expects that all settings should be inclusive and make their accommodation available to all children regardless of their Special Educational Need (SEN) or disability, Members may agree that an additional childcare setting in this area would be beneficial to the community.

With regard to the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding residential buildings, a revised acoustic testing report was submitted and measures have been proposed to protect neighbouring occupiers from adverse noise levels. These measures include reducing the outside activity time periods to three 15 minute sessions per day and erecting a 2.5m acoustic absorptive barrier around the garden boundary. Consequently, the Council's Environmental Health officer has raised no objections to the proposal and, subject to conditions restricting children numbers and opening times of the setting, the proposal is, on balance, unlikely to result in significant noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents.

The proposed 2.5m high fence would be positioned around the rear garden boundary starting from the back of the application building. In terms of the impact it would have on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, the most significantly affected would be No.3 Edward Road, to the north-east of the application site. The proposed fence would be in close proximity to the rear ground floor windows of No.3 and would give rise to a degree of overshadowing at the neighbouring site, particularly to the recessed garden area to the rear. It would also appear somewhat prominent. However, in this case Members may consider that the additional 30cm height above that of a typical garden fence, which is proposed in order to mitigate undue noise levels, is, on balance, acceptable.

With regard to the proposed front boundary treatment, there is a 1.8m fence opposite the application site around the perimeter of Whiteaves and, as such, the proposed front boundary wall and railings would, in principle, appear acceptable. A condition is recommended to ensure full details of all boundary treatments are subsequently submitted.

The site has a low PTAL rating and the applicant has supplied information relating to how they propose to reduce the reliance on travelling to the nursery by car. This includes references to the physical layout of the site which would provide limited off-street car parking; the provision of 4 cycle parking spaces for staff; a Travel Plan Co-ordinator to provide travel planning advice to mobility impaired persons; the introduction of car sharing amongst staff and parents; the provision of storage space within the building for buggies for those who have walked; identifying suitable pedestrian routes and suggesting improvements of those routes to the Local Authority; identifying principal public transport routes and identifying measures to improve passenger's journeys. While the planning statement acknowledges that kerb-side parking would also occur, in terms of highways, transport and road safety issues, the proposal is not considered to result in a significant detrimental impact. Conditions are recommended, should permission be granted, including details to be submitted relating to visibility splays, parking bay size and parking layout.

It is clear that there will be an impact on adjacent properties as a result of this proposal and a judgement needs to be made about whether the impact is unduly harmful. Accordingly, Members will need to take account of the plans that have been submitted for this site and the comments made by residents during the consultation process. However, based on the above it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not have a significantly harmful impact on the amenities of occupiers of surrounding residential properties, or on road safety in the vicinity. Furthermore, the proposal would retain a small element of residential use which would help to mitigate the loss of housing at the site.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file refs 14/03125; 14/00104; 12/03319; 12/00833; 11/02415 and 10/02755 set out in the planning history section above, excluding exempt information.

as amended by documents received on 21.01.2015 19.02.2015 02.04.2015

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1ACA01 Commencement of development within 3 yrs

ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years

2ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan

In order to comply with Policies BE1, EMP8, H1, T2, T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the residential amenities of the area, housing supply in the Borough and in the interests of road safety and promoting sustainable modes of transport

3 Before commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted parking spaces and/or garages and turning space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter shall be kept available for such use and no permitted development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages.

It is necessary to ensure that before the use commences the site is capable of providing the parking spaces, as approved, in order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

4 Prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted, a Travel Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan should include measures to promote and encourage the use of alternative modes of transport to the car. It shall also include a timetable for the implementation of the proposed measures and details of the mechanisms for implementation and for annual monitoring and updating.

The Travel Plan shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed timescale and details.

Before the use commences it is necessary to ensure appropriate management of transport implications of the development and to ensure the development accords with Policy T2 of the Unitary Development Plan

5ACH12	Vis. splays (vehicular access) (2 in)	3.3 x 2.4 x 3.3m	1m		
ACH12R	Reason H12				
6ACH22	Bicycle Parking				
ACH22R	Reason H22				
7ACH32	Highway Drainage				
ADH32R	Reason H32				
8ACA07	Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted				
ACA07R	Reason A07				
9ACH04	Size of parking bays/garages				
ACH04R	Reason H04				
10ACJ12	Use as day nursery/playgroup (5 insert)	3 months	5 years	36	
	07:30 18:30				
ACJ12R	J12 reason				

INFORMATIVE(S)

1 RDI16

This page is left intentionally blank

Application No : 15/01044/FULL1

Ward:
Copers Cope

Address : Tudor Manor Beckenham Place Park
Beckenham BR3 5BP

OS Grid Ref: E: 537655 N: 170445

Applicant : Mr Tom Sheridan

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 3 four bedroom two storey detached dwellinghouses with integral garages

Key designations:

Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 3 four bedroom two storey detached dwellinghouses with integral garages.

The application is a revised submission following a previous refusal as detailed below.

The three dwellings will be of a detached design with individual characteristics, detailing and material differences but are broadly of the same footprint and are all of the same height at 8.8m to the ridge point. The dwellings are separated by a gap of 4m between the flank walls, 3.8m to the boundary with West Lodge to the south and 3m to the boundary to Beckenham Place Park. A single access point will remain, with the central property providing a shared driveway to allow access to either side from the existing access point from Beckenham Place Park.

Location

The site is located on the west side of Beckenham Place Park and comprises a single detached mock Tudor dwellinghouse located adjacent to the entrance to the park. Spacious grounds lie within the site leaving a gap of approximately 11m to West lodge to the south and 9m to the boundary of the park. The boundary of the Borough is situated on the north east flank boundary, with the park itself being within the London Borough of Lewisham. The park is designated as Metropolitan Open Land by the London Borough of Lewisham. To the rear of the site are flats in Lynn Court and Barry Court. A row of garages adjoin the immediate rear boundary. Substantial screening with mature vegetation and trees surround all the boundaries of the site.

The site is located within the Beckenham Place Park, Foxgrove Avenue & Foxgrove Road Area of Special Residential Character.

Consultations

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

- o Concerns regarding amount of construction traffic. Safety needs to be addressed due to access to park at this point.
- o Amended proposal still results in a cramped, overdeveloped site that would damage the character of that part of Beckenham Place Park.
- o Spacing on same side of road as the proposed development is significantly wider than those opposite. Narrower gaps would be inconsistent.
- o Revised proposal has changed very little. Only the footprint has changed.
- o Development located at entrance to park will corrupt the ASRC status of the area.
- o Another speculative housing development.
- o Increased traffic to five way junction on Beckenham Place Park. Are there junction improvements. This will increase traffic and cause additional hazards.
- o Tudor manor is good example of a mock Tudor building. Sets character for the street.
- o Level of density and proximity is unacceptable.
- o Road is narrow at point of site. Proposal will lead to congestion and increased parking.
- o Tripling houses will lead to more traffic on road.
- o It will result in loss of an historically important house.
- o This area has a special character that enhances Beckenham as a whole. Tudor manor is a good example and is irreplaceable part of Beckenham history.
- o Density levels that are acceptable in other locations are not acceptable here.
- o A gross overdevelopment. Will set a precedent.
- o Would not maintain character and appearance of the surrounding area.
- o Landscaping will not protect the site.
- o Tudor Manor is part of a coherent group that is a characteristic of the ASRC. The proposal would undermine this at a prominent point on entry to the park.
- o Significant impact on privacy to adjacent boundaries.
- o Result in loss of quiet location and pleasant ambience.
- o Over develop site altering its character from a semi-rural ambience to a more harsh urban effect.
- o Proposed buildings of no discernible architectural merit.
- o Three houses close together does not add anything to the character of the area.
- o Damage to road. Will the builder repair the road.
- o Special nature of road will be reduced by loss of fine example of mock Tudor house.
- o Estate to rear of the site will be overlooked by the three houses.
- o Beckenham Place Park is an ASRC. Three new houses would not be in keeping with this statement.

- o Tremendous impact on environment and wildlife in the area.
- o Extra parking on grass verges will damage them
- o Outlook will be ruined from flats to the rear.

Comments from Consultees

Highways: The site is located to the north of Beckenham Place Park (unadopted road). The site would be accessed from Beckenham Place Park, via an existing vehicular crossover leading to garages, which is acceptable. Parking, two spaces for each unit is provided which is satisfactory.

Environmental Health - Pollution: No objections in principle.

Environmental Health - Housing: The applicant is advised to have regard to the Housing Act 1985's statutory space standards contained within Part X of the Act and the Housing Act 2004's housing standards contained within the Housing Health and Safety Rating System under Part 1 of the Act.

Drainage: This site appears to be suitable for an assessment to be made of its potential for a SUDS scheme to be developed for the disposal of surface water.

Thames Water: No objections.

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
 H1 Housing Supply
 H7 Housing Density and Design
 H9 Side Space
 H10 Areas of Special Residential Character
 NE7 Development and Trees
 ER7 Contaminated Land
 ER10 Light pollution
 T3 Parking
 T7 Cyclists
 T18 Road Safety

SPG No.1 - General Design Principles
 SPG No.2 - Residential Design Guidance

London Plan (July 2011)

Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply.
 Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
 Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
 Policy 3.8 Housing choice
 Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation

Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban greening
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater Infrastructure
Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
Policy 5.16 Waste self-sufficiency
Policy 5.17 Waste capacity
Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
Policy 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

Housing: Supplementary Planning Guidance. (November 2012)

Planning History

14/04265/FULL1: Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of 3 five bedroom two storey detached dwellinghouses with integral garages. Refused 15/1/2015.

Reason for refusal:

The proposed development by reason of its prominent siting, sub-standard spatial relationship to existing adjacent dwellings and between proposed dwellings within the site in this prominent location represents a cramped overdevelopment of the site which would appear detrimental to and out of character with surrounding development and harmful to the visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies BE1, H7 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Conclusions

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- o Principle of Development
- o Design

- o Standard of Residential Accommodation
- o Highways and Traffic Issues
- o Impact on Adjoining Properties
- o Sustainability and Energy
- o Ecology and Landscaping

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.

Principle of Development

Housing is a priority use for all London Boroughs and the Development Plan welcomes the provision of small scale infill development in the areas of stability and managed change provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides for garden and amenity space. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states in Paragraph 49 that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The NPPF sets out in paragraph 14 a presumption in favour of sustainable development. In terms of decision-making, the document states that where a development accords with a local plan, applications should be approved without delay. Where a plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted.

The document also encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed (brownfield land) and excludes gardens from the definition of previously developed land.

Policy H7 of the UDP sets out criteria to assess whether new housing developments is appropriate subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining and future residential occupiers of the scheme, car parking and traffic implications, community safety and refuse arrangements.

The site is located in a residential location in a residential area where the Council will consider infill development provided that it is designed to complement the character of surrounding developments, the design and layout make suitable residential accommodation, and it provides for garden and amenity space. Any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, conservation and historic issues, biodiversity or open space will need to be addressed.

Paragraph 35 of the NPPF details that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in

determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

It has been identified within objections that the loss of the existing building would be regrettable. However, while the architectural style and aesthetics of the existing building are complimentary in the locality the building is not a heritage asset. Therefore the provision of replacement and additional dwellings on the land is acceptable in principle subject to an assessment of the impact of the proposal on the appearance/character of the surrounding area, the residential amenity of adjoining and future residential occupiers of the scheme, car parking and traffic implications, sustainable design and energy, community safety and refuse arrangements.

Density

The density of the proposal would be 13 units per hectare (u/ha). Table 3.2 of the London Plan sets out the appropriate density range for a site with a PTAL of 2 in a suburban area as 35-65 u/ha. The density of the proposal is below that guideline by this measure and is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Design, Siting and Layout.

Policy 3.4 of the London Plan 2011 specifies that Boroughs should take into account local context and character, the design principles (in Chapter 7 of the Plan) and public transport capacity; development should also optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range.

Policy BE1 states that development should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. Development should not detract from the existing street scene and/or landscape and should respect important views, skylines, landmarks or landscape features. Space about buildings should provide opportunities to create attractive settings with hard or soft landscaping and relationships with existing buildings should allow for adequate daylight and sunlight to penetrate in and between buildings.

Policy H7 requires that the site layout, buildings and space about buildings are designed to a high quality and recognise as well as complement the qualities of the surrounding areas.

Policy H9 requires that new residential development for a proposal of two or more storeys in height a minimum of 1m side space from the side boundary is maintained and where higher standards of separation already exist within residential areas. proposals will be expected to provide a more generous side space.

Policy H10 requires applications for development in the Areas of Special Residential Character will be required to respect and complement the established and individual qualities of the individual areas.

The Beckenham Place Park, Foxgrove Avenue & Foxgrove Road Area of Special Residential Character describes the area as a private road with a mixed character and at the western end, a pleasant residential area comprising some post-war as well as substantial inter-war detached family houses of no particular architectural merit, but in a good setting with the statutorily listed lodges to Beckenham Place Park at the entrance from Southend Road.

To address the previous reason for refusal in respect of the sub-standard spatial relationship to existing adjacent dwellings and between proposed dwellings within the site in this prominent location, that was considered to create a cramped overdevelopment of the site, the applicant has amended the footprints of the dwellings and spacing.

Therefore, the spacing between the proposed properties has now been increased from 3m to 4m within a total site width of approximately 45m. Opposite the site, as a comparison, the total plot width of the three properties at Parkside, Lyndhurst and Sunarise totals 54.6m.

The plot widths of the three properties to the south of the site are approximately 23.5m (Fairways), 22.5m (Dunbar) and 24.6m (Holypark) each. The distance between the flank walls of these properties ranges between 4.1m and 8m.

Therefore as the ASRC description suggests the spatial standards in the vicinity are relatively generous and this forms part of the character of the immediate area of the site. This spatial character quality is also most notable from Beckenham Place Park as the site is approached and viewed from this direction.

It is noted that despite the increase in separation qualities the spacing is not quite as generous as the existing properties to the west side of the road. However, the increase is notable and on balance, Officers consider that the greater level of separation indicated between properties is sufficient to now maintain the established and individual qualities of the ASRC.

The design of the dwellings as detailed above is traditional in format. The mass and scale is also proportional and reflective of the architectural typology of similar properties in the vicinity. Therefore it is considered that the individual design approach of each house represents a high quality design that will make a positive contribution to the streetscene and the ASRC.

Residential Amenity

Standard of Residential Accommodation

The floor space size of Plot 1 is 278m² and Plots 2 and 3 is 281m² respectively. Table 3.3 of the London Plan requires a Gross Internal Area of 107m² for a two storey four bedroom dwelling house. On this basis the floorspace provision is considered to be acceptable.

The shape, room size and layout of the rooms in the proposed building is considered satisfactory. None of the rooms would have a particularly convoluted layout which would limit their use. All habitable rooms would have satisfactory levels of light and outlook.

In terms of amenity space the depth of the rear gardens are of sufficient proportion to provide a usable space for the purposes of a family dwellinghouse.

Car parking and Highways

Integral and driveway parking spaces are provided for each dwelling. The Council's Highways Officer has not raised objection in this regard. Due to the relatively minor impact of the additional units on parking issues in the vicinity it is considered the proposal would generally be in accordance with UDP Policy T3 and Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (2011).

Concern has been raised regarding damage to the unmade private access road during construction. A construction management plan condition is recommended to address this issue within its remit.

Cycle parking

Cycle parking is generally required to be 1:1 for residential development. The applicant has not provided details of a location for lockable cycle storage for each unit. It is assumed that the integral garage will provide for this purpose.

Refuse

All new developments shall have adequate facilities for refuse and recycling. The applicant has provided details of refuse storage for the units in the front curtilage adjacent to the main access. The location point is considered acceptable. Further details can be conditioned in this regard for a containment structure.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

In terms of outlook, the fenestration arrangement will provide front, flank and rear outlook. Concerns have been raised regarding loss of privacy and overlooking to the rear of the site. However, it is noted that a substantial distance of at least 40m will remain to properties at the rear of the site.

Proposed first floor flank windows are provided to dressing areas in the layout of each property. It is recommended that these are obscure glazed along with bathroom windows as indicted to maintain privacy. On this basis, it is considered that the dwellings will not result in loss of privacy or overlooking of adjacent property.

Sustainability and Energy

Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction of the London Plan states that the highest standards of sustainable design and construction should be achieved in

London to improve the environmental performance of new developments and to adapt to the effects of climate change over their lifetime. Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions of the London Plan states that development should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the hierarchy; Be Lean: use less energy; Be clean: supply energy efficiently and Be green: use renewable energy.

An informative is recommended with any approval to ensure that the development strives to achieve these objectives.

Lifetime Homes

The applicant has confirmed that the development will be Lifetime Homes compliant.

Landscaping

An indicative landscaping layout has been submitted as shown on the proposed site plan drawing that details the areas given over to garden for external amenity for future occupiers.

Much of the existing trees and perimeter screening is to be retained. No objections are raised in this regard. Notwithstanding this full detail of hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment can be sought by condition.

Community Infrastructure Levy

The Mayor of London's CIL is a material consideration. CIL is payable on this application and the applicant has completed the relevant form.

Summary

The development would have a high quality design and would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, subject to suitable conditions. It is considered that the density and tenure of the proposed housing is acceptable and that the development would not be detrimental to the character of the Area of Special Residential Character. The standard of the accommodation that will be created will be good. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on the local road network or local parking conditions. The proposal would be constructed in a sustainable manner and would achieve good levels of energy efficiency. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is granted subject to the imposition of suitable conditions.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1ACA01 Commencement of development within 3 yrs
 ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
 2ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan
 ACK05R K05 reason
 3ACA04 Landscaping Scheme - full app no details
 ACA04R Reason A04
 4ACA07 Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted
 ACA07R Reason A07
 5ACB01 Trees to be retained during building op.
 ACB01R Reason B01
 6ACB02 Trees - protective fencing
 ACB02R Reason B02
 7ACB03 Trees - no bonfires
 ACB03R Reason B03
 8ACB04 Trees - no trenches, pipelines or drains
 ACB04R Reason B04
 9ACC08 Satisfactory materials (all surfaces)
 ACC08R Reason C08
 10ACH04 Size of parking bays/garages
 ACH04R Reason H04
 11ACH18 Refuse storage - no details submitted
 ACH18R Reason H18
 12ACH29 Construction Management Plan
 ACH29R Reason H29
 13ACH32 Highway Drainage
 ADH32R Reason H32
 14ACD06 Sustainable drainage system (SuDS)
 To ensure satisfactory means of surface water drainage and to accord with Policy
 5.13 of the London Plan (2011)
 15ACI12 Obscure glazing (1 insert) all windows to the first floor flank walls
 of the buildings
 ACI12R I12 reason (1 insert) Policies BE1 and H7
 16 No extensions or alterations to the building(s) hereby approved, whether or
 not permitted under Article 3 to Schedule 2 of the Town and Country
 Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order
 revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order) of that Order, shall be carried
 out without the prior written permission of the local planning authority.
 Reason: In order that, in view of the nature of the development hereby permitted,
 the local planning authority may have the opportunity of assessing the
 impact of any further development and to comply with Policies BE1 and H7
 of the Unitary Development Plan.

INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1 The applicant is advised that any works associated with the implementation
 of this permission (including the demolition of any existing buildings or
 structures) will constitute commencement of development. Further, all pre
 commencement conditions attached to this permission must be discharged,
 by way of a written approval in the form of an application to the Planning
 Authority, before any such works of demolition take place.
- 2 RDI25

- 3 RDI10
- 4 Before the use commences, the Applicant is advised to contact the Pollution Team of Environmental Health & Trading Standards regarding compliance with the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and/or the Environmental Protection Act 1990. The Applicant should also ensure compliance with the Control of Pollution and Noise from Demolition and Construction Sites Code of Practice 2008 which is available on the Bromley web site.
- 5 If during the works on site any suspected contamination is encountered, Environmental Health should be contacted immediately. The contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Authority for approval in writing.
- 6 It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921. This is to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.
- 7 Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.
- 8 The buildings hereby approved shall strive to achieve sustainable design and construction standards to improve their environmental performance and to adapt to the effects of climate change over their lifetime in accordance with the hierarchy; Be Lean: use less energy; Be clean: supply energy efficiently and Be green: use renewable energy detailed in Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions and Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction of the London Plan.

This page is left intentionally blank

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 15/01173/DEMCON

Ward:
Bickley

Address : 107 Plaistow Lane Bromley BR1 3AR

OS Grid Ref: E: 541498 N: 169535

Applicant : Mr Andrew Xenii

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of dwelling (Consultation under Part 31 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995/as amended)

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Sundridge Avenue
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 10

Proposal

This application has been submitted in order to give prior notification of the demolition of this dwelling under Part 31 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended).

The applicant states that demolition is required as the building is in a dilapidated condition and that redevelopment of the site is required.

Additional information was received on 20th May 2015 regarding the restoration and landscaping of the site. The applicant also confirmed that it is intended to erect hoardings around the perimeter of the site during demolition and restoration works for reasons of health and safety.

Location

This detached dwelling is located on the north-eastern side of Plaistow Lane, and backs onto Sundridge Avenue Conservation Area. It is locally listed.

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received, including from Sundridge Residents' Association which can be summarised as follows:

- the existing house is of historical and architectural interest and should be restored not demolished
- the loss of the building would have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Sundridge Avenue Conservation Area
- the house has been deliberately neglected in order to facilitate demolition
- traffic congestion during demolition works
- noise and air pollution during demolition
- part of the garden to the rear of No.5 Sundridge Avenue falls within the Conservation Area
- the site should be maintained and monitored by a security company to prevent fly tipping.

Comments from Consultees

Environmental Health raise no objections.

Historic England does not consider it necessary to be notified of the application.

Planning Considerations

The application falls to be considered under Part 31 of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (as amended).

Prior approval was deemed to be required in respect of the restoration of the site in a decision notice dated 16th April 2015, as insufficient information was submitted regarding the proposed restoration and re-landscaping of the site, including whether hoardings would be erected around the site.

The application has been called into committee by Ward Councillors.

Planning History

Permission was granted in February 2013 (ref.12/02650) for extensions to this property, and amendments to the permitted scheme were approved in November 2014 under ref.14/02184.

Conclusions

The main issue for consideration is whether prior approval should be granted for the method of demolition and restoration of the site.

The applicant has confirmed that any spoil from the demolition will be removed from the site and taken to an appropriate landfill site by the demolition contractor, and that following demolition, the site will be restored and re-landscaped. In this respect, further information regarding the restoration and re-landscaping of the site was submitted, and the details are considered acceptable.

The local listing of the building does not offer any protection from demolition, and the property, apart from a small part of the garden, does not lie within a conservation area. Historic England (previously English Heritage) did assess the site with a view to statutory listing, but decided not to on the basis that it had been altered and was of a lower standard than other Newton houses.

In light of the additional information provided, the proposed method of demolition and restoration of the site is considered acceptable.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PRIOR APPROVAL REQUIRED AND GRANTED

INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1 If during works on site any suspected contamination is encountered, Environmental Health should be contacted immediately. The contamination shall be fully assessed and an appropriate remediation scheme submitted to the Local Authority for approval in writing.
- 2 Before works commence, the applicant is advised to contact the Pollution Team of Environmental Health & Trading Standards regarding compliance with the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and/or the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

This page is left intentionally blank

Application No : 15/01267/FULL6

Ward:
Crystal Palace

Address : 59 Anerley Park Penge London SE20
8NU

OS Grid Ref: E: 534813 N: 170448

Applicant : Mrs Tara Coley

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Single storey side/rear extension with roof lights and elevational alterations including juliet balcony

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds Aldersmead Road
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds
Smoke Control SCA 6

Proposal

Proposal

It is proposed to erect a flat-roofed single storey extension at the side/rear. The property has an existing original two storey rear projection which is identical to that at the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. The proposed extension would project by 3m beyond the existing rear wall of the dwelling where it adjoins No. 61. The boundary line is set at an angle and accordingly the flank wall adjacent to No. 61 would slightly encroach over the boundary (Certificate B completed).

The extension would be 8.25m wide at the rear, and would project from the main flank elevation towards the boundary with Ravenswood Court by approx. 3.85m. A side space of 1m would be retained to the boundary with Ravenswood Court and no flank windows are proposed.

The front, side and main rear walls would be constructed of London stock bricks to match the existing, with large sliding doors set into the rear elevation.

The extension would be 3m high and the roof would incorporate a substantial area of structural glazing. The plans additionally show the installation of a Juliet balcony with French doors to the first floor.

Location

The host dwelling is a Victorian semi-detached house which lies on the north-western side of Anerley Park. It lies to the southwest of the other half of the pair of semi-detached houses (No. 61) and to the northeast of a block of maisonettes known as Ravenswood Court. Of that block, Nos. 5 and 5 Ravenswood Close lie on the other side of the boundary. The flats incorporate flank fenestration in addition to a large first floor rear facing window and ground floor patio doors.

The distance between the existing main flank wall of No. 59 and the maisonettes adjacent is approx. 8m at the front, reducing to 6m at the rear. Sited in between the flank walls is a modest detached garage associated with Ravenswood Court.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

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

- o The plans are inaccurate
- o The proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site, out of character with the surrounding landscape
- o The extensions would be too close to the flank facing windows at Nos. 5 & 6 Ravenswood Court and would result in a tunnelling effect, loss of light and outlook
- o Loss of privacy
- o Materials would not be in keeping with the existing building

Planning Considerations

Planning Considerations

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
H8 Residential Extensions

The following Council adopted SPG guidance is also a consideration:

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

The above policies are considered consistent with the objectives and principles of the NPPF. Policies within the London Plan are also a consideration.

Planning History

There is no recent planning history although in 2006 planning permission was refused for the erection of a new self-contained part one/two storey detached dwelling in between the host dwelling and the maisonettes at Ravenswood Court

(ref. 06/03256). Planning permission was refused on the grounds that the proposal would have constituted an overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the amenities of neighbouring properties and resulting in loss of privacy. The proposed house aligned at the front and rear with the existing dwellings on either side, and was sited immediately adjacent to the boundary with Ravenswood Court.

Conclusions

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the proposal 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.

The extension would encroach on the existing side garden area behind the garage associated with Ravenswood Court. As such it would be partially visible from the street frontage, albeit mostly obscured from view by the existing detached garage. The proposed extension would consequently have a limited visual impact on the street scene. Constructed of bricks to match the existing host dwelling, while the extension would have a flat-roofed appearance from the front, the impact of the extension in this respect would not be sufficiently adverse as to render the proposals unacceptable.

With regards to the impact of the proposals on residential amenity, the adjacent ground floor flat has a clear-glazed flank kitchen window, and large patio doors at the rear of the building. The flank window is reported to be the primary light source to a flank facing room. As a consequence, it is necessary to carefully consider the impact of the proposal on the amenities of this property.

The extensions are set away from the south-western flank boundary by 1m and the adjacent flats are themselves set away from the boundary by a similar distance. In addition, the retention of a courtyard area between the front wall of the extension and the rear elevation of the shed would mitigate to some extent the visual impact that the proposal would have when viewed from the side of adjacent property. While the extension would project towards the flank boundary with Nos. 5 and 6 Ravenswood Court, the retention of space around the building and the 3m flat-roof height is considered, in conjunction with the orientation of the dwellings in relation to each other, to sufficiently limit the impact of the proposal in terms of loss of light and prospect to the adjacent flats.

The adjacent flank window to the ground floor flat is set at a reasonably high position in the wall and the floor level in the adjacent ground floor flat appears higher than that in the host dwelling. It would not be uncommon for the boundary

between the properties to be marked by a 2m high fence or wall. The existing trellis-topped wall is reasonably high, and the window sits above the fence height. On balance it is considered that the flat-roofed extension would not have a seriously detrimental impact on the amenities of the adjacent properties, when taking into account the height of average garden boundary treatments, the position of the window and the retention of a small open area between the front elevation of the side extension and the rear elevation of the garage.

The rearward projection of the proposed extension is not considered excessive in the context of the site and surrounding property and would enable the retention of a reasonable-sized rear garden. While it is noted that the adjacent flats currently have views over the boundary into the rear garden of the host dwelling, the loss of a view is not in itself a material planning consideration, although loss of outlook, daylight and sunlight would constitute material planning considerations to be taken into account in the determination of this application.

While permission was refused in the past for a detached one/two storey dwelling between No. 59 and Ravenswood Court, the application in that case proposed development significantly closer to the boundary of the site with Ravenswood Court, and with a generally more bulky and cramped appearance, as well as providing self-contained residential accommodation rather than an extension. The proximity and height of the proposed dwelling was specifically referred to in ground 3 of the refusal. The height of the proposed dwelling was greater than that currently proposed and the new house was proposed to be sited adjacent to the boundary. It is not considered that the refusal of planning permission in 2006 undermines the potential for the residential extension of the existing dwelling.

The concerns of neighbouring residents are acknowledged; however, it is not considered on balance that the application proposal would have a seriously detrimental impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring property, nor on the visual amenities of the street scene. While the extension would have a reasonably large floor area and a flat-roofed appearance, its height, rearward and flank projection in relation to the boundary would not be excessive and the use of matching brickwork on the walls would soften the visual impact of the proposals.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents or impact detrimentally on the character of the area.

as amended by documents received on 13.04.2015 27.04.2015
RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| 1ACA01 | Commencement of development within 3 yrs |
| ACA01R | A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2ACC04 | Matching materials |
| ACC04R | Reason C04 |
| 3ACK01 | Compliance with submitted plan |

ACK05R K05 reason

4 The flat roof area of the single storey rear extension shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area.

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

This page is left intentionally blank

Application No : 15/01327/FULL6

Ward:
West Wickham

Address : 1 The Crescent West Wickham BR4 0HB

OS Grid Ref: E: 539312 N: 167440

Applicant : Mr Andre Verazzo

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey side extension and single storey rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 2

Proposal

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for a part one/two storey side extension and single storey rear extension.

The part one/two storey side extension will project 2.836m in width from the northern side of the property to abut the northern side boundary which forms the rear boundaries of no.'s 164-182 Goodhart Way. The two storey element of the proposed side extension will extend in line with the existing rear elevation of the main dwelling for a length of 6.51m, and will be set back from the front building line of the property. The single storey element of the side extension will then project a further 1.911m forward of the two storey element. The roof of the two storey element of the side extension will be hipped to a similar angle as the existing roof of the main dwelling and will be set lower than the ridge of this existing main roof. Amended drawings were received on 23.04.15 to indicate a small parapet along the side of the roof to prevent the overhang of the eaves. The single storey element of the side extension will have a pitched roof which will slope down from the front elevation.

The single storey rear extension will replace an existing single storey rear extension to project 4.638m in depth from the rear of the dwellinghouse for the full width of the existing dwelling. It will abut the boundary with the adjoining semi at no. 3 and will retain a distance of 2.836m from the northern flank wall to the northern side boundary. The single storey rear extension will have a flat roof to a height of approximately 3.35m, when scaled from the submitted drawings.

Location

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property on the eastern side of The Crescent, West Wickham. The surrounding properties are residential with some being detached and others semi-detached. The northern side boundary of the property forms the rear boundaries of no.'s 164-182 Goodhart Way.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

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

- o There should be no overhanging guttering or pipework
- o There should be no overhanging eaves or any other part of the building protruding over the boundary
- o There should be no protruding flue to dissipate fumes over the garden
- o No fencing should be removed and the neighbouring garden should not be damaged
- o Neighbouring property at no. 166 and 168 Goodhart Way will not allow any part of their garden to be utilised for the erection of the building and no scaffolding on their land or access to their land
- o Neighbouring property at no. 166 and 168 Goodhart Way will not allow any access for future cleaning and maintenance
- o Proposed work will take a long time and will deny access to peaceful garden and disrupt lives of neighbouring property
- o The extension will mean the property will be closer to the gardens of Goodhart Way taking away sense of openness, space and fresh air
- o The new side wall of the property should be finished the same as the rest of the house which will be difficult without access to neighbouring land
- o Footing required for extension will damage the decking at the rear of no. 168 Goodhart Way
- o Increased bulk imposing visually on the use of the land to the rear of no. 166 Goodhart Way
- o Extension will decrease value to neighbouring property

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

Comments from Consultees

There were no internal or external consultees consulted on this application.

Planning Considerations

Planning Considerations

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
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space

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

The above policies are considered to be consistent with the principles and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Planning History

Under ref: 06/02164/FULL6 planning permission was granted for a Side dormer extension.

Under ref: 06/04222/FULL6 planning permission was granted for a Part one/two storey front/side extension.

Under ref: 08/00916/FULL6 planning permission was granted for a Part one/two storey front/side extension (Revisions to permission ref. 06/04222 to increase roof height and bulk and elevational alterations).

Under ref: 15/01322/PLUD a certificate of lawfulness was granted for a Side and rear roof extensions and front roof lights.

Conclusions

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.

Planning permission for a Part one/two storey front/side extension at the property has been previously approved by ref: 06/04222/FULL6, with a revision to this permission granted under ref: 08/00916/FULL6. These previous applications had a similar design to that of this proposed application, with the part one/two storey front/side extension projecting up to the side boundary and retaining an element of subservience with a lower ridge height than the host building. The previously permitted side extensions showed the single storey element projecting further forward than this proposed application.

Policy H9 of the UDP indicates that normally a minimum of 1m side space from the flank wall to the side boundary for the full height and length of a proposal for two or more storeys. This policy seeks to prevent a cramped appearance within the streetscene and to safeguard the amenities of the neighbouring properties. This application proposes a part one/two storey extension which will abut the northern side boundary, which forms the rear boundaries of no.'s 164-182 Goodhart Way. There is approximately a minimum distance of 23m from this boundary to the rear of these properties in Goodhart Way. The previously permitted applications also

extended to the side boundary and did not provide this 1m side space. However, these applications were considered to be acceptable as the sense of space, which policy H9 seeks to maintain, was considered to be retained due to the positioning of the property in relation to those in Goodhart Way. A number of concerns have been raised by the neighbouring properties at no.'s 166 and 168 Goodhart Way. Many of these concerns relate to the impact of the building work on their land, encroachment over the boundary and prevention of access to their land during and after the construction of any works. Whilst these concerns are noted, they are private legal matters and cannot be taken into account as not material considerations in the determination of a planning application. Furthermore, the plans submitted do not appear to indicate any encroachment over the boundary, with the amended drawings received 23.04.15 showing a revised roof design to prevent the overhang of the eaves and guttering. There are no flank windows proposed in the side extension, which will prevent the opportunities for any direct overlooking. Taking all this account and given the previous permissions at the site, Members may consider that in this instance there would not be a cramped appearance nor a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties resulting from this side extension and as such the aims and objectives, which policy H9 seeks to ensure, are achieved.

The proposed design of the part one/two storey side extension shows the two storey element set back from the front building line and the ridge height lower than the main roof, which reduces the scale of the extension and creates an element of subservience. The materials are indicated to be similar to that of the existing dwelling and the roof of the two storey element is shown to be hipped at an angle similar to that of the main roof providing a coherent appearance to the dwelling. Therefore, whilst the extension will create an element of unsymmetrical appearance between the semi's, Members may consider that the scale and design of the proposed part one/two storey side extension is sympathetic to that of the host dwelling and adjoining semi, and therefore compliant with the general aims and objectives of policy H8 and BE1 in relation to scale and design.

The single storey rear extension will project 4.638m in depth, which the submitted drawings indicate will be similar to that of the existing single storey extension which is to be replaced. It will be separated from the northern side boundary by a distance of 2.836m and will abut the southern side boundary with the adjoining semi at no. 3. No. 3 The Crescent also benefits from a single storey rear extension which projects to a similar depth as the existing extension at the host dwelling, and as such also the proposed extension. The extension will not be visible from the street scene, and the application indicates materials similar to that of the existing property. As such, the scale and design proposed is considered appropriate to host dwelling. There are no windows proposed in the southern flank elevation. A set of sliding doors are proposed in the northern elevation. However, these will be at single storey and located some distance from the rear of the neighbouring properties in Goodhart Way. Accordingly, taking the above into account, Members may consider that the single storey rear extension would not cause any significant harm to the amenities of the neighbouring properties nor the character of the host dwelling and area in general.

Having had regard to all the above Members may consider that, on balance, the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents nor cause an unacceptable degree of impact on the host dwelling or character of the surrounding area.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the files set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1ACA01 Commencement of development within 3 yrs
- ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
- 2ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan
- ACK01R K01 reason (insert reason)
- 3ACC04 Matching materials
- ACC04R Reason C04
- 4ACI13 No windows (2 inserts) northern flank part one/two storey
side extension
- ACI13R I13 reason (1 insert) BE1

This page is left intentionally blank

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

Application No : 15/01049/FULL1

Ward:
Bickley

Address : St Georges School Tylney Road
Bromley BR1 2RL

OS Grid Ref: E: 541613 N: 169084

Applicant : Mrs Geraldine Shackleton

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Part one/two storey extension comprising 3 classrooms and studio to enable expansion of school from one and a half form entry to two form entry, single storey extensions to provide enlarged Year 1 classroom and toilet facilities and provision of canopies, decking, replacement steps and landscaping

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Local Cycle Network
Gas Holder Stations Gas_Holders_stations:
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds
Local Distributor Roads
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 13
Smoke Control SCA 12

Proposal

Permission is sought for the construction of extensions to this primary school comprising a part one/two storey extension to the south and west of the main school buildings which would contain 3 classrooms and a studio, along with small single storey infill extensions to the infants school building to provide an enlarged classroom and w.c. facilities.

The proposals would enable the expansion of the school from one and a half form entry to two form entry. This would result in an increase in pupil numbers from 316 to 420, and an increase in staff from 40 to 46 phased in over 6 years.

A canopy and decking would be provided adjacent to the new classroom building, and a further canopy and landscaped area would be provided within the northern

part of the site, along with amendments to the external stairs. A canopy to the front infants building is also proposed.

The application is accompanied by a Transport Assessment, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, a Contaminated Land Desk Study, an Ecological Habitat Survey Report, and a Plant Noise Assessment.

Location

This school site is located on the western side of Tylney Road between Pembroke Road and Nightingale Lane, and extends to the rear behind residential properties in those roads. The main school buildings are located within the eastern part of the site, whilst the main playground areas are located at a lower level within the western part of the site. Residential properties surrounding the playground are at a higher level.

Comments from Local Residents

No third party comments have been received to date.

Comments from Consultees

The Council's Highway Engineer agrees with the findings of the Transport Assessment submitted, and considers that there would be sufficient spare capacity for parking in surrounding roads. The School Travel Plan should be kept up to date in order to try to reduce car trips to and from the school.

No drainage objections are seen to the proposals, and Thames Water has no concerns.

No objections are raised from an Environmental Health point of view, but safeguarding conditions regarding contaminated land, plant noise levels and control of pollution are suggested.

Planning Considerations

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

- BE1 Design of New Development
- C1 Community Facilities
- C7 Educational and Pre-School Facilities
- T3 Parking
- T18 Road Safety

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are the impact of the proposals on the amenities of nearby residents and the impact on pressure for parking and road safety in surrounding roads.

Policy C7 of the UDP generally supports extensions to schools, and in cases where they would result in an increase in the number of pupils, the adoption of a School Transport Plan is required.

The proposed extensions are located to the rear of the main school, and would not be very visible from the public domain. The part one/two storey classroom extension would be flat roofed, similar to the adjoining building, and would extend down into the lower level playground. It would be situated some distance from residential properties to the north and south, and would not therefore have a harmful impact on the amenities of adjoining residents.

The small infill extensions to the infants' classrooms would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the building, nor affect residential amenity.

The replacement steps within the northern part of the site would not cause any additional harm, and the adjacent landscaped area with decking and a canopy would enhance the existing playground facilities for pupils within this part of the site.

The Council's Highway Engineer has confirmed that the proposals for the expansion of the school from one and a half form entry to two form entry is considered acceptable from a highway point of view, subject to the submission of an up to date School Travel Plan.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|
| 1 | ACA01
ACA01R | Commencement of development within 3 yrs
A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2 | ACC07
ACC07R | Materials as set out in application
Reason C07 |
| 3 | ACD02
AED02R | Surface water drainage - no det. submitt
Reason D02 |
| 4 | ACH30
ACH30R | Travel Plan
Reason H30 |
| 5 | ACK01
ACK05R | Compliance with submitted plan
K05 reason |

This page is left intentionally blank

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

Application No : 15/01088/FULL6

Ward:
West Wickham

Address : 11 Boleyn Gardens West Wickham BR4
9NG

OS Grid Ref: E: 537981 N: 165588

Applicant : Mr Chris Mullins

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

First floor side extension (amendment to permitted application 14/03116/FULL6 to include alterations to roof and bay window)

RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 51

Proposal

Proposal

The application seeks retrospective permission for a first floor side extension. The application is an amendment to permitted application 14/03116/FULL6 to include alterations to the roof and bay window. The roof has been extended in width with the parapet wall removed, and the bay window within the extension enlarged with a pitched roof to match the bay window in the existing property.

Location

The application site is a two storey semi-detached property on the south-eastern side of Boleyn Gardens, West Wickham. The surrounding properties are of similar size and design, although some appear to have benefited from extensions.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

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

- o Out of scale with neighbouring properties
- o Detracts from appearance of the road
- o Over development
- o Applicant has ignored the terms of the planning permission previously granted and if the applicant can build whatever he wants and then obtain permission for it what is the point of having planning laws
- o Application states that no additional access to the highway will be required and no trees removed, but a driveway has been constructed and a tree removed
- o Drawings are incorrect
- o Extension is not in accordance with others in the area
- o Roof has been extend much further than previously approved
- o Imposing structure which is oversize
- o Loss of privacy and overlooking to neighbouring property across the road
- o No. 14 Boleyn Gardens was refused permission under ref: 03/02124/FULL6 because of the size and over dominance as no. 14 wanted the same pitched roof over the garage.
- o The application is a quality improvement to that dwelling and the neighbourhood
- o The work has been carried out to a high standard in a professional manner with minimum nuisance to neighbours

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

Comments from Consultees

There were no internal or external consultees consulted on this application.

Planning Considerations

Planning Considerations

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
H8 Residential Extensions
H9 Side Space

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

The London Plan and National Planning Policy Framework are also key considerations in determination of this application.

The above policies are considered to be consistent with the principles and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Planning History

Under ref: 93/00235/FUL planning permission was granted for a single storey front/side extension.

An application for a First floor side extension was refused under ref: 14/01286/FULL6 for the following reason;

'The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirements for a 1 metre side space to be maintained to the flank boundary in respect to two storey development, in the absence of which the proposal would constitute a cramped form of development and contrary to Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.'

More recently planning permission was granted for a 'First floor side extension' under ref: 14/03116/FULL6.

Conclusions

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 application is an amendment to previously approved application 14/03116/FULL6. As such, the principle of a first floor side extension has been established. The applicant has applied retrospectively for amendments to the extension which include an extended roof, the removal of the parapet wall to the side, and an enlarged bay window with pitched roof above. The Council has received comments from a neighbouring property and the West Wickham Residents' Association in objection to the scheme. A letter of support for the application has also been received from a neighbouring resident.

The main issues are whether the amended design constitute a significantly detrimental impact on the appearance of the host dwelling and area in general, and whether the amendments cause any additional impact than the previously approved scheme on the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties, as to warrant a refusal of planning permission. Further to comments received from a neighbouring property, it is noted that an application at no. 14 Boleyn Gardens was refused under ref: 03/02124/FULL6 for a 'Two storey front/side extension and single storey rear extension'. One of the reasons for refusal was the projection of the extension forward of the main front building line and inclusion of a gable end roof design which lead to a bulky and over dominant extension. However, this extension differs from that of this application at no. 11, in that it projected forward of the main front building line and contained a half hip roof design and front gable end feature. Furthermore, it must be noted that there were other concerns with this previous scheme at no. 14 which lead to its refusal. In addition, each case must be determined on it's own merits in accordance with the relevant policies at the time of submission.

Policies H8 and BE1 of the Council's UDP are of relevance in this instance. Policy H8 seeks to ensure that the scale, form and materials should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and should be compatible with development in the area. Policy BE1 refers to the design of new development and seeks, amongst other matters, that development that is imaginative and attractive to look at, and complements the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas.

The increase to the roof allows for a pitched roof above the enlarged gable end. The design of the roof remains hipped, to match the adjoining semi, and as such Members may consider that the increased bulk does cause any additional impact to the character of the host dwelling or residential amenities of the neighbouring properties than the previously permitted scheme. The enlarged bay window with pitched roof above is located in the front elevation facing the highway. Concerns have been raised with regards to overlooking to the front windows and rear gardens of the property at no. 10 which lies opposite the application site. However, whilst these concerns are noted, Members must consider the relationship between the host dwelling and neighbours on the opposite side of the highway, whether the enlarged window leads to any additional opportunities for overlooking than currently exist from the upper windows of the existing property or the proposed window in the previously approved scheme. The design of the window and pitched roof is similar to that of the bay window in the existing property. Concerns have also been raised with regards to its size and dominance. Whilst it is larger in size and provides a more dominant feature than the previously approved smaller bay window, Members may consider that the appearance remains in keeping with the style of the host dwelling and that of the adjoining semi and other neighbouring properties. Furthermore, Members may also consider that the scale of this feature is not significantly detrimental to the character of the host dwelling or area in general as to warrant a refusal on this basis.

Having had regard to the above, Members may considered that, on balance, the development 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 the files set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

1ACA01	Commencement of development within 3 yrs
ACA01R	A01 Reason 3 years
2ACK01	Compliance with submitted plan
ACK05R	K05 reason
3ACC04	Matching materials
ACC04R	Reason C04

4ACI09	Side space (1 metre) (1 insert)	south-western			
ACI09R	Reason I09				
5ACI13	No windows (2 inserts)	south-western	first	floor	side
	extension				
ACI13R	I13 reason (1 insert)	BE1			

This page is left intentionally blank

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

Application No : 15/01265/FULL1

Ward:
Bickley

Address : 5 Wells Road Bickley Bromley BR1 2AJ

OS Grid Ref: E: 542760 N: 169290

Applicant : Mr Marc Powell

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of detached two storey 5 bedroom dwelling with accommodation in roof and integral garage

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 10

Proposal

It is proposed to demolish the existing house on this plot, and construct a detached two storey five bedroom dwelling which would include accommodation in the roof. The new dwelling would be of a contemporary style with a mansard roof. An integral garage would be provided, and frontage parking would be retained.

The new dwelling would provide a 1.4m separation to the northern and southern flank boundaries, whilst the dwelling would project approximately 7m further forward than the existing house on its southern side adjacent to No.1 Wells Road (known as Wells House). The overall height of the dwelling would increase by 0.8m, although the mansard roof would have hipped sides.

The main two storey part of the house would not project further to the rear than the existing two storey dwelling, and the proposed rear single storey element would project a similar distance to the rear as the existing extension/conservatory.

Location

This site is located on the western side of Wells Road, and is bounded to the south by Wells House (a locally listed building), and to the north by No.1 Wellands Close. It lies immediately adjacent to Bickley Park Conservation Area to the south and east.

The existing house is of a modern design with a catslide roof over the forward projecting garage on the northern side of the building. It currently has a single storey rear extension with a rear conservatory attached.

The plot has a rear garden depth of 16m, and a beech tree at the far end of the garden is protected by a TPO.

Consultations

Letters objecting to the proposals have been received from local residents, and the main points raised are summarised as follows:

- * cramped overdevelopment of the site
- * overlarge building which would be too close to the side boundaries
- * overdominant appearance within the street scene
- * design is out of character with neighbouring houses
- * detrimental to the character and appearance of the adjoining Bickley Park

Conservation Area

- * detrimental to the setting of the adjacent locally listed building
- * detrimental to the privacy and amenities of neighbouring residential properties
- * the construction of the dwelling would threaten the long-term health and visual amenity of the protected beech tree.

Comments from Consultees

The Council's Highway Engineer has commented that the depth of the garage is substandard, however, there would be sufficient space on the site frontage for parking, and no objections are therefore raised.

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas object to the proposals which are considered to have a detrimental impact on the adjacent Conservation Area due to the size, design and contrast to other buildings.

There are no drainage objections to the proposals and Thames Water raises no concerns.

No tree comments have been received to date.

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
BE13 Development Adjacent to a Conservation Area
H7 Housing Density & Design
H9 Side Space
T3 Parking

The NPPF is also an important consideration.

This application has been called into committee by a Ward Councillor.

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are the impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the adjacent Bickley Park Conservation Area, on the setting of the adjacent locally listed building, on the amenities of nearby residential properties, and on the protected beech tree in the rear garden.

The proposed dwelling would project between 2.5-7m further forward than the existing dwelling, but it would still be set back at least 11m from the front boundary. The adjoining properties at 1 Wellands Close and Wells House are set further forward in their plots such that the new dwelling would still be set back 1m from the front wall of 1 Wellands Close (to the north), and would project a maximum 2m forward of Wells House (to the south). It would therefore sit within the general building line along this part of Wells Road.

The proposed dwelling would be situated slightly closer to Wells House, whilst still maintaining a 1.4m separation to the boundary, and would be set slightly further away from 1 Wellands Close, again providing a 1.4m separation to the boundary. It would have an overall height of 8.5m which would be slightly lower than Wells House and slightly higher than 1 Wellands Close, and the mansard roof would be hipped back at the front and sides to lessen the impact.

The site lies adjacent to rather than within the Conservation Area, and the overall size and bulk of the new building, along with its reasonably spacious setting, would not appear unduly cramped within the street scene, nor have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area. Furthermore, it would comply with the Council's side space policy which requires a minimum 1m separation to be provided to the flank boundaries.

Although the new dwelling would be of a more contemporary design than the locally listed buildings to the south and east, the surrounding area has a variety of different house types and designs, with more modern styles prevalent to the north and west of the site. It would not, therefore, appear out of character with this mixed form of development, nor detract from the setting of the adjacent locally listed building.

With regard to the impact on residential amenity, the proposed dwelling would not project further to the rear than the existing dwelling at two storey or single storey level, although the single storey element would extend closer to 1 Wellands Close, whilst still maintaining a minimum 1m separation to the northern flank boundary with this property. No first floor flank windows are proposed in the northern elevation facing this property, and no undue loss of light or outlook would occur.

With regard to Wells House to the south, the facing flank wall of the new dwelling would have a large double height staircase window and a first floor en-suite window, both of which can be conditioned to be obscure glazed. First floor windows in the northern flank elevation of Wells House are to a bathroom and store room, and would not be unduly affected by the proposals.

With regard to the impact on the protected beech tree at the far end of the rear garden, the replacement dwelling would be located in a similar position as the existing, and the impact of the proposals are not, therefore, considered to be significant.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1ACA01 Commencement of development within 3 yrs
- ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
- 2ACB01 Trees to be retained during building op.
- ACB01R Reason B01
- 3ACB02 Trees - protective fencing
- ACB02R Reason B02
- 4ACB03 Trees - no bonfires
- ACB03R Reason B03
- 5ACB04 Trees - no trenches, pipelines or drains
- ACB04R Reason B04
- 6ACC07 Materials as set out in application
- ACC07R Reason C07
- 7ACD02 Surface water drainage - no det. submitt
- AED02R Reason D02
- 8ACH03 Satisfactory parking - full application
- ACH03R Reason H03
- 9ACI12 Obscure glazing (1 insert) in the southern flank elevation
- ACI12R I12 reason (1 insert) BE1
- 10ACI17 No additional windows (2 inserts) first floor flank dwelling
- ACI17R I17 reason (1 insert) BE1
- 11ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan
- ACK05R K05 reason
- 12ACK05 Slab levels - no details submitted
- ACK05R K05 reason

INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1 You are advised that this application may be liable for the payment of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the Planning Act 2008. The London Borough of Bromley is the Collecting Authority for the Mayor and this Levy is payable

on the commencement of development (defined in Part 2, para 7 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)). It is the responsibility of the owner and /or person(s) who have a material interest in the relevant land to pay the Levy (defined under Part 2, para 4(2) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010)).

If you fail to follow the payment procedure, the collecting authority may impose surcharges on this liability, take enforcement action, serve a stop notice to prohibit further development on the site and/or take action to recover the debt.

Further information about Community Infrastructure Levy can be found on attached information note and the Bromley website www.bromley.gov.uk/CIL

This page is left intentionally blank

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

Application No : 15/01312/FULL1

Ward:
Petts Wood And Knoll

Address : 6 Ladywood Avenue Petts Wood
Orpington BR5 1QJ

OS Grid Ref: E: 545361 N: 167699

Applicant : Mr Simon Rockall

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of 6 Ladywood Avenue (former Friends Meeting House) and construction of 2 no. two storey detached five bedroom dwellings with new vehicular access and associated parking and landscaping

Key designations:

Area of Special Residential Character
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Open Space Deficiency
Smoke Control SCA 4

Proposal

Proposal

- The application seeks permission for the demolition of 6 Ladywood Avenue (former Friends Meeting House) and the construction of 2 no. two storey detached five bedroom dwellings with new vehicular access and associated parking and landscaping.

- One new detached garage is proposed to the north-west corner of the site which would be accessed via Greencourt Road. The existing vehicular access along Greencourt Road would also still be utilised.

- The building is currently vacant but prior to this it was used as a friends meeting house of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). This use ceased on 6th April 2014 and the building has been vacant since this date.

- There are two trees located close to the northern property boundaries that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO); one ash and one sycamore.

Location

The application site is located on the corner of Ladywood Avenue and Greencourt Road, set within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character. At present the site comprises a large two storey property that fronts Ladywood Avenue and the area is residential in nature.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and their comments can be summarised as follows:

- o In general are supportive of the scheme but do have concerns regarding change to outlook;
- o Existing outlook is over the plot of the garden and grounds, with no view of existing building;
- o Part of the proposed development will encroach on this outlook, but also that any further permitted development would be of greater detriment;
- o Note that double yellow line parking restrictions are planned to remain which are supported and should remain in force;
- o Note that the plot was originally planned for 2 dwellings (mentioned by the developer) but this surely would have been for semi-detached dwellings and not 2 detached dwellings?
- o Appendix 1 of the UDP refers to the predominant character and appearance of the Petts Wood ASRC;
- o The existing site comprises one detached property with generous spacing and mature trees along Greencourt Road;
- o Accept that the existing building on the plot stands out as an anomaly compared with predominant pattern of development within this ASRC, and that originally the design was for two plots, this does not itself contribute a reason for approving the application;
- o The original design was more than likely for 2 modest semi-detached houses, not for two very large, over-dominant detached houses;
- o Proposed buildings almost 3 times the size of neighbouring dwellings with gardens a fraction of the size;
- o Approval of scheme would constitute overdevelopment of the ASRC and contrary to UPD policies;
- o Agree more housing is needed in the UK, but the demand is not for £1m plus properties and is therefore not a valid consideration;
- o The site does currently positively contribute to the verdant and open streetscene in this part of the ASRC;
- o Object to landscaping to the front of the site, will be to the detriment to the ASRC;
- o Existing trees along Greencourt Road boundary positively contribute to the streetscene and if removed, they should be replaced with similar examples;
- o Level of hard landscaping is inappropriate in the ASRC;
- o Second property is to be built three stories high with a large window at the top of the dwelling which will overlook property on Greencourt Road;

- o Inappropriate to have a detached garage to the property nearest Greencourt Road;
- o No similar examples on corner plots within the ASRC, and the garage should be made integral to the host dwelling;
- o Acknowledge that the existing building is in need of repair and positively support the conversion of the existing building to solely residential use;
- o However close attention should be paid to the likely impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the amenities of neighbouring residential properties, having particular regard to indicative layout and design of the proposed scheme, and the impact upon the Petts Wood ASRC.

Comments from Consultees

The Council's Highways Engineer raised no objection to the proposal. It was stated that Plot 1 has a new crossover with parking on the frontage for 3 cars, and will also utilise the existing crossover on Greencourt Road with a garage and another parking space. Plot 2 will have a new crossover leading to a good sized garage and other parking on the frontage.

The Council's Drainage Engineer stated that they accept the proposed initial drainage strategy to include two soakaways for each property, one at the front and one at the back of the property to attenuate for surface water run-off. It is accepted that the details design will be submitted at a later stage. It was also considered that the site appears to be suitable for an assessment to be made of its potential for a SUDS scheme to be developed for the disposal of surface water.

Environmental Health (Housing) stated that the applicant is advised to have regard to the Housing Act 1985's statutory space standards contained within Part X of the Act and the Housing Act 2004's housing standards contained within the Housing Health and Safety Rating System under Part 1 of the Act.

Thames Water raised no objection to the proposal.

Planning Considerations

Planning Considerations

The proposal falls to be considered primarily with regard to the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP):

- H1 Housing Supply
- H7 Housing Density and Design
- H9 Side Space
- H10 Areas of Special Residential Character
- T3 Parking
- T11 New Accesses
- T18 Road Safety
- BE1 Design of New Development
- NE7 Development and Trees

C1 Community Facilities

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

London Plan policies:

3.3 Increasing Housing Supply
3.4 Optimising Housing Potential
3.5 Design and Quality of Housing Developments
3.8 Housing Choice
5.1 Climate Change
5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction
6.9 Cycling
6.13 Parking

National Planning Policy Framework

All new housing should also be designed to meet the changing needs of Londoners over their lifetimes and 10% of new housing should be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. The application does include the 16 point checklist to demonstrate that all dwellings will comply with the Lifetime Homes Standard, within a Lifetime Homes/Wheelchair Housing Statement.

Planning History

No relevant planning history at the site.

Conclusions

Conclusions

All new development should seek to optimise the potential of a site, and such development should, amongst other things, be attractive and respect local context, character and built heritage in accordance with the policies quoted above. The application site is located within the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) and as such, it is even more important that any development proposals within the ASRC should respect and complement the established and individual qualities of the individual areas. The original plans for the Petts Wood ASRC date from the late 1920s and early 1930s, and whilst the houses were built over a number of years, the road layout and plot sizes were established in an overall pattern and the layout remains largely intact today. Therefore any development proposal on this plot should respect this existing character within the wider area.

In terms of the principle of the redevelopment of the site for residential use, it is considered that is acceptable. The existing building is not considered to be of any particular architectural merit and whilst the area is characterised by large detached

dwellings, there is no particular uniformity in terms of the design of the properties. Therefore the demolition of the property is not resisted.

The proposed new dwelling on plot 1 would have a minimum separation to the southern property boundary (shared with No.8) of approximately 1.3 metres at the closest part increasing to approximately 1.8 metres, and a separation to the northern property boundary (shared with proposed plot 2) of approximately 1.5 metres.

The proposed new dwelling on plot 2 would have a minimum separation to the southern property boundary (shared with proposed plot 1) of approximately 1.5 metres, and a minimum separation to the northern property boundary (shared with the corner of Greencourt Road) of approximately 3.3 metres, increasing at various points to a maximum separation of approximately 5.3 metres. The greatest level of separation at this plot would be towards the front of the proposed new dwelling.

These proposed levels of spatial standards between the proposed new dwellings and the neighbouring property boundaries are considered to be in keeping with the prevailing character of the area, and the larger separation to the corner with Greencourt Road is considered suitable in order to prevent a cramped form of development on this corner location and undue harm to the character of the ASRC.

The front elevation of the proposed dwellings would be built roughly in line with the front elevation of No.8 Ladywood Avenue and the properties further along this section of the road, with the two storey element of the proposed property on Plot 1 largely in line with the rear elevation of No.8, with a single storey element projecting beyond this. There is a significant degree of separation between the single storey rear element the proposed dwelling at Plot 1 and No.8 Ladywood Avenue, and it is considered that this, along with the orientation of the properties, helps to prevent detrimental harm to the visual and residential amenities and levels of natural light afforded to No.8 Ladywood Avenue.

There is a general design form of properties along Ladywood Road. The current proposal includes details of the materials that would be used for the proposed dwellings, and these along with the design are considered to match the existing design features within the streetscene, which will enhance the character of the streetscene and ASRC in general. A street scene plan has also been submitted which is considered to help in terms of the context along the road and how the proposed dwellings would fit into the streetscene. This indicates that the maximum height of the proposed dwellings would match the height of Nos. 8, 10, 12 and 14 Ladywood Avenue, which is considered important in terms of the impact upon the visual amenities of the ASRC and the residential amenities of the occupiers of no.8 Ladywood Road and properties on the opposite side of Ladywood Road in particular.

The proposed dwellings would meet London Plan minimum sizes and would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers. In addition, all new housing should also be designed to meet the changing needs of Londoners over their lifetimes and 10% of new housing should be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. The

application does include the 16 point checklist to demonstrate that all dwellings will comply with the Lifetime Homes Standard, within a Lifetime Homes/Wheelchair Housing Statement.

The proposed development is likely to be liable for a charge under the Community Infrastructure Levy for Mayoral CIL as it involves the creation of new residential floor area, however this charge is not payable until after development begins.

On balance, it is considered that introducing 2 new residential dwellings at this site is in keeping with the prevailing character of the area and as such is considered acceptable.

The proposal is considered to comply with Chapter 3 of the London Plan (2011) and the Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment.' Furthermore, in relation to the current application the proposed residential accommodation would meet London Plan minimum sizes and would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers, and no concerns were raised by Environmental Health notwithstanding the need to have regard to the Housing Act 1985's statutory space standards contained within Part X of the Act and the Housing Act 2004's housing standards.

Members will note that key planning considerations must include impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the impact upon the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character, however on balance it is considered that the relationship to neighbouring buildings, and the possibility of overlooking, noise and disturbance by reason of the introduction of two new residential dwellings to this site will not have a detrimental impact on the residential and visual amenities of the neighbouring properties, nor will the proposal have a negative impact upon the character of the ASRC generally.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 15/01312, set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | |
|--------|--|
| 1ACA01 | Commencement of development within 3 yrs |
| ACA01R | A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2ACK01 | Compliance with submitted plan |
| ACC01R | Reason C01 |
| 3ACA04 | Landscaping Scheme - full app no details |
| ACA04R | Reason A04 |
| 4ACA07 | Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted |
| ACA07R | Reason A07 |
| 5ACC01 | Satisfactory materials (ext'nl surfaces) |
| ACC01R | Reason C01 |
| 6ACC03 | Details of windows |

ACC03R Reason C03
 7ACD02 Surface water drainage - no det. submitt
 ADD01R Reason D01
 8ACD06 Sustainable drainage system (SuDS)
 AED06R Reason D06
 9ACH03 Satisfactory parking - full application
 ACH03R Reason H03
 10ACH16 Hardstanding for wash-down facilities
 ACH16R Reason H16
 11ACH32 Highway Drainage
 ADH32R Reason H32
 12ACI02 Rest of "pd" Rights - Class A, B,C and E
 In order to comply with Policies H7 and BE1 and to prevent overdevelopment of the site.
 13ACI12 Obscure glazing (1 insert) in the first floor flank elevations
 ACI12R I12 reason (1 insert) BE1
 14ACI17 No additional windows (2 inserts) flank elevations dwellings
 ACI17R I17 reason (1 insert) BE1
 15ACK05 Slab levels - no details submitted
 ACK05R K05 reason

INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1 RDI16
- 2 RDI25
- 3 RDI10
- 4 The applicant is advised to have regard to the Housing Act 1985's statutory space standards contained within Part X of the Act and the Housing Act 2004's housing standards contained within the Housing Health and Safety Rating System under Part 1 of the Act.
- 5 The applicant is advised that with regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0800 009 3921. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.
- 6 The applicant is advised that Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

This page is left intentionally blank

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

Application No : 15/01431/FULL6

Ward:
Cray Valley West

Address : 197 Leasons Hill Orpington BR5 2NQ

OS Grid Ref: E: 546133 N: 168639

Applicant : Mr Ali Gunes

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Two storey side/rear extension

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds Aldersmead Road
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds
Local Distributor Roads
Smoke Control SCA 17

Proposal

It is proposed to add a two storey side/rear extension which would be set back 2.5m from the front of the dwelling, and would project 3m further to the rear. The front part of the extension would be set back 0.837m from the side boundary of the site but the separation would increase to 3.3m at the rear due to the tapering nature of the plot.

The pitched roof over the extension would be set approximately 0.5m lower than the main roof of the property.

Location

This semi-detached dwelling is located on the southern side of Leasons Hill, and backs onto properties in Clarendon Way.

Comments from Local Residents

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

Comments from Consultees

The Council's Highway Engineer raises no objections to the removal of the existing garage as there would still be room to park a number of vehicles on the frontage.

Planning Considerations

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
- H8 Residential Extensions
- H9 Side Space

Conclusions

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character and spatial standards of the surrounding area and on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

The front corner of the proposed two storey extension would maintain only a 0.837m separation from the flank boundary, which would not strictly speaking comply with the Council's side space policy (H9) as it requires a minimum 1m separation to be provided to the side boundary in respect of two storey development. However, most of the extension provides a separation in excess of the 1m minimum, and there are no properties immediately adjacent to the proposed extension (only the rear garden of No.73 Clarendon Way).

The proposed extension would have a subservient roofline, and the proposals are not, therefore, considered to have a seriously detrimental impact on the character and spatial standards of the surrounding area.

With regard to the impact on neighbouring properties, the extension would be set back 6.6m from the flank boundary with the adjoining semi at No.195, and no loss of light or outlook would therefore occur.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 ACA01 Commencement of development within 3 yrs
ACA01R A01 Reason 3 years
- 2 ACH03 Satisfactory parking - full application
ACH03R Reason H03
- 3 ACI07 Restrict to members of household (1 in) at 197 Leeson
Hill, Orpington
ACI07R Reason I07
- 4 ACI13 No windows (2 inserts) first floor flank development

5 ACI13R I13 reason (1 insert) BE1
 ACK01 Compliance with submitted plan
 ACK05R K05 reason

This page is left intentionally blank

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 15/00864/FULL1

Ward:
Chelsfield And Pratts
Bottom

Address : Cookham Farm Skeet Hill Lane
Orpington BR5 4HB

OS Grid Ref: E: 548838 N: 165519

Applicant : Ms Sally Campbell

Objections : YES

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing dwelling garage, barn and outbuildings and erection of detached two storey 4 bedroom dwelling with first floor terrace and solar panels on roof.

Key designations:

Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Green Belt
London City Airport Safeguarding
Smoke Control SCA 26

Proposal

It is proposed to demolish the existing farmhouse, a detached garage, a barn, a concrete pig sty building and a timber shed, and construct a replacement two storey dwelling further to the south, whilst retaining an existing workshop building in the northern part of the site, and an open barn to the west of the proposed new dwelling.

The existing dwelling has a floorspace of 120.8sq.m., whilst the floorspace of the existing garage, barn, shed and pig sty totals 145.2sq.m. Therefore, the total floorspace of buildings to be removed under this proposal would be 266sq.m.

The proposed two storey dwelling would have a floorspace of 280sq.m. with a footprint of 159sq.m., and would be located approximately 13m to the south of the existing dwelling, and 9m to the east of the existing open barn which is to remain. It would be of a contemporary L-shaped design, and would be set lower into the sloping site resulting in upper and lower ground floor levels requiring the construction of concrete retaining walls. The dwelling would have a flat roof with solar panels and a green roof system planted with wild meadow flowers and grasses. An upper floor terrace would be provided to the southern and eastern elevations overlooking open fields.

The application is accompanied by a Design and Access Statement, a Sustainability Statement, and a structural survey of the condition of the existing farmhouse which concludes that remedial work is required in the form of underpinning the building, which is not considered by the applicant to be economically viable.

Location

This site is located on the southern side of Skeet Hill Lane, and lies within the Green Belt. It occupies an area of 0.7ha., and incorporates a farmhouse, a garage, a workshop building and a number of barns and outbuildings. The site slopes down towards the south and east.

Consultations

A letter of objection has been received from Feathercot to the east of Cookham Farm on Skeet Hill Lane, and the concerns raised are summarised as follows:

- * inappropriate development in the Green Belt due to size, siting and appearance, with no very special circumstances put forward to outweigh harm to the Green Belt
- * contrary to the NPPF which states that replacement buildings in the Green Belt should not be materially larger than the existing building
- * the size and position of the dwelling is substantially more obtrusive and detracts from the openness of the immediate setting
- * the design of the dwelling is out of character with those in the surrounding area, and does not represent an outstanding or innovative design to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- * significant excavation and engineering works would be detrimental to the Green Belt
- * the former agricultural buildings should not be included in the floorspace calculations as a recent appeal decision did not accept that they were ancillary or incidental to the main dwelling
- * inadequate and inaccurate figures given for the buildings to be demolished
- * the floorspace for the new dwelling does not include the extensive balconies and veranda
- * the barn to be removed is an unlawful structure which was erected less than 4 years ago, and its floorspace should not be taken into account
- * a recent Lawful Development Certificate to establish the residential curtilage was dismissed on appeal, and the current proposals include an even larger curtilage than that dismissed
- * the large amount of glazed areas would result in excessive light pollution
- * no ecological or bat surveys have been submitted
- * a new dwelling was recently refused at Cookham Hill Farm 200m to the west.

The occupiers of Woodlands, which lies on the opposite side of Skeet Hill Lane, have confirmed that they support the application.

Comments from Consultees

The Council's Highway Engineer raises no objections to the proposed replacement dwelling as it would use the existing vehicular access onto Skeet Hill Lane, and would not result in an unacceptable increase in trips to and from the site.

No objections are raised from an environmental health or drainage point of view, subject to safeguarding conditions.

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
H7 Housing Density and Design
G1 The Green Belt
G5 Replacement Dwellings in the Green Belt
T3 Parking

The National Planning Policy Framework is also relevant.

The application has been called in to committee by a Ward Councillor.

Planning History

A number of Certificates of Lawfulness have been submitted for extensions to the existing house, an outbuilding for a gym and games room, and the use of an existing outbuilding as a workshop, home office and living accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling. A further Certificate was submitted for the establishment of the residential curtilage. They are summarised as follows:

Ref.12/02411 for a two storey rear extension, a single storey side extension and a porch to the principal elevation was refused on the following grounds:

"The proposed side and rear extensions do not constitute development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse and are not development permitted under Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (as amended)."

Ref.12/02418 for the erection of a single storey outbuilding for use as a gym and games room within the residential curtilage for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling was refused on the following grounds:

"The proposed outbuilding is located outside of the residential curtilage of the dwellinghouse and its size and proposed use go beyond that expected for an ancillary building and it is therefore not development permitted under Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (as amended)."

Ref.12/02419 for the proposed use of an existing outbuilding to the eastern boundary as a workshop, home office, bedroom, bathroom and storage ancillary to the main dwelling was refused on the following grounds:

"The outbuilding is located outside of the residential curtilage of the dwellinghouse and does not constitute a use ancillary to the main dwelling."

Ref.12/03653 for the use of the land as a residential curtilage and the use of outbuildings within that curtilage as being ancillary to the existing dwelling was refused on the following grounds:

"The residential curtilage identified has not subsisted, on the balance of probabilities, for more than ten years continuously and as such is not considered to be lawful and as such the outbuildings contained therein do not constitute a use ancillary to the main dwelling."

The subsequent appeal was dismissed in March 2014, wherein the Inspector found that although it appeared that the appeal site and all the buildings within it comprised at that time the residential curtilage of the dwellinghouse, there was insufficient evidence to establish that the residential curtilage was lawful as it had not been demonstrated that the land and buildings benefitted from a lawful use for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse during the previous 10 years. For this reason, the Inspector was unable to define the lawful residential curtilage of Cookham Farm.

Conclusions

The main issues in this case are whether the proposals comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt, particularly with regard to the lack of an established residential curtilage, and if so, whether very special circumstances exist that clearly outweigh the harm by reason of inappropriateness or any other harm; and secondly, whether the proposals would be harmful to the character or appearance of the surrounding area, or detrimental to the amenities of nearby residential properties.

In the recent appeal decision, the Inspector was unable to define the lawful residential curtilage of Cookham Farm with any reasonable certainty due to the limited evidence provided, and the current situation therefore is that outside the footprint of the dwelling itself, the land and outbuildings do not have lawful curtilage status. The proposal is to provide a replacement dwelling on land which is at least 13m away from the existing dwelling and does not form part of an established residential curtilage to Cookham Farm, and would therefore constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt for that reason. No residential curtilage has been put forward by the applicant, but the accompanying site plan shows a red line around a larger part of the site than was dismissed on appeal.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) contains a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Paragraph 87 states that such development should not be approved except in very special circumstances, whilst paragraph 89 sets out a number of exceptions, including the replacement of

a building where the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

Policy G5 of the UDP allows for a replacement dwelling in the Green Belt provided that the resultant dwelling would not result in a material net increase in floor area compared with the existing dwelling (an increase of over 10% would normally be considered material, depending on design issues), and that the size, siting, materials and design of the replacement dwelling would not harm the visual amenities or the open or rural character of the locality.

The existing dwelling has a floor area of 120.8sq.m., whilst the new dwelling would have a floor area of 280sq.m., resulting in an increase in floor area of 159.2sq.m., which equates to a 132% increase. This constitutes a material net increase in floor area compared with the existing dwelling, and would therefore be considered inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The applicant has put forward the special circumstances that 4 outbuildings would be removed (a garage, barn, shed and pig sty), however, none of these lie within 5m of the dwellinghouse, and it has not been established that any of these buildings have lawful curtilage status. Furthermore, the barn to be removed lies outside the area that was previously sought as the residential curtilage of the dwelling under ref.12/03653.

With regard to the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, the proposed dwelling would encroach further south into a part of the site which is currently more open and rural in appearance, and although it has been designed to address the sloping land levels, it would appear more prominent on the site than the existing smaller scale dwelling which is set closer to the road and further away from the open part of the site. Significant excavation works would be required, and the proposals are therefore considered to have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities and open and rural character of the Green Belt.

With regard to the impact on residential amenity, the replacement dwelling would be located a significant distance away from neighbouring properties, and the proposals are not, therefore, considered to result in any undue loss of light, privacy or prospect to adjoining residents.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED

The reasons for refusal are:

The proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of its size, bulk and location outside an established residential curtilage, constitutes inappropriate development within the Green Belt which would be harmful to its openness and character. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated to warrant the setting aside of normal policy requirements, and the proposal is

therefore contrary to Policy G5 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

The proposed dwelling, by reason of its size, bulk and siting, would appear overprominent on the site, and would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities and open and rural character of the Green Belt, thereby contrary to Policies BE1, H7 and G5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

INFORMATIVE(S)

1 RDI25

Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS

Application No : 15/01911/TELCOM

Ward:
Cray Valley East

Address : Land Opposite 27-33 Chelsfield Road
Orpington

OS Grid Ref: E: 547322 N: 167128

Applicant : CTIL, Telefonica UK Ltd _ Vodafone Ltd **Objections :** YES

Description of Development:

Proposed replacement telecommunications installation upgrade and associated works

CONSULTATION BY CTIL, TELEFONICA UK LTD AND VODAFONE LTD
REGARDING THE NEED FOR PRIOR APPROVAL OF SITING AND
APPEARANCE

Key designations:

Areas of Archeological Significance
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
London City Airport Safeguarding
Local Distributor Roads
Smoke Control SCA 31
Smoke Control SCA 26

Proposal

Proposal

- This application seeks prior approval for replacement telecommunications installation upgrade and associated works. This will involve the installation of a 12.5 metre high Jupiter T-Range Replica Telegraph Pole on a new root foundation and 4 no. new cabinets at ground level.

- The new telegraph pole will provide new coverage and capacity for both Vodafone and O2.

Location

The site is located on the grassed verge adjacent to the tarmac footpath on the southern side of Chelsfield Road on the corner with Northfield Avenue.

Consultations

Comments from Local Residents

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

- o Pole is excessively tall and would dominate the area;
- o Out of proportion to all other structures around it;
- o Health and safety hazard due to excessive height;
- o Strong winds are regularly funnelled down Northfield Avenue and Chelsfield Road, causing existing telegraph pole to wobble alarmingly; a pole twice the height would be even more vulnerable to gusts;
- o Adverse impact on lighting, outlook and privacy of all nearby houses;
- o Proposed cabinets appear to be excessively tall and wide;
- o Cabinets would dwarf nearby postbox and bench, forming an ugly line of structures having no relation to their environment;
- o Cabinets would be an eyesore;
- o Cabinets are not sited very thoughtfully;
- o Cabinets would be an invitation for graffiti and late night visitors;
- o Cabinets would be a health and safety risk due to their siting, and would impede and obstruct the passage of people embarking and disembarking the buses regularly stopping at this point;
- o Cabinets would also obstruct 'school run' parents and children from nearby school;
- o The existing small green provides a modest piece of relief in this heavily built-up environment, and the proposed structures would ruin it;
- o Cabinets are out of character with, and disproportionate to, the scale of all surrounding structures;
- o Proposal will ruin the existing outlook currently enjoyed by all properties in the area;
- o Potential health hazard;
- o The boxes emit noise which would be highly audible;
- o Enclosed photographs of the area to show the impact that the proposal would have;
- o Loss of value and saleability of nearby properties;

Comments from Consultees

Environmental Health raised no technical objection concerning the application.

Planning Considerations

Planning Considerations

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

BE1 Design of New Development
BE22 Telecommunications Apparatus
T6 Pedestrians

The National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 5: Supporting high quality communication infrastructure.

Planning History

No recent planning history at the site.

Conclusions

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 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.

Local objections have been received concerning the potential health risks associated with the installation of the proposal. However, documentation has been provided to confirm compliance with the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) and as such these concerns cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

It is acknowledged that the proposed mast would involve the sharing of infrastructure between two telecommunications operators, however it also proposes the introduction of new cabinets and would not utilise any of the existing equipment in the vicinity of the site, providing additional street furniture in the area which is considered to add to the street clutter.

The proposal is situated in a prominent and open corner junction and would be immediately visible to the area; the open space contributes substantially to the character of the area and provides considerable visual and amenity value. The proposed pole would, at 12.5m in height and given its appearance, be an over-dominant and an intrusive feature in the street scene, harmful to the visual amenities of the area and the amenities of nearby residential properties. The additional visual impact of the associated equipment would compound this harm and represent an erosion of the valuable open space at this location.

Additionally, the equipment would obstruct the free passage of pedestrians when work is being carried out with the doors likely to cause a blockage of the pavement whilst the partial location on the open grassed area further compounds the impact of the development upon the open nature of the site within this junction.

In light of the above, Members may agree that prior approval would be required for this telecommunications development, and in view of the harm that would be

caused to the visual amenities of the area including nearby residential properties, the siting and appearance proposed should be disapproved.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on the file ref(s) 15/01911 set out in the Planning History section above, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: REQUIRE AND REFUSE PRIOR APPROVAL

Due to their height, siting and design, the proposed mast and ancillary equipment would be obtrusive and highly prominent features in the street scene, out of character and detrimental to the visual and residential amenities of the surrounding area and contrary to Policy BE22 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework;

Due to the size and position of the equipment cabinets, the proposal is likely to give rise to an unacceptable impact upon the free passage of pedestrians using the footpath, contrary to Policy T6 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.