

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 6 September 2018

Present:

Councillor Richard Scoates (Chairman)
Councillor Simon Fawthrop (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Marina Ahmad, Gareth Allatt, Peter Dean, Kate Lymer,
Robert Mcilveen and Kieran Terry

11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Michael Turner; Councillor Kieran Terry attended as substitute.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Russell Mellor.

12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

13 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 12 JULY 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 July 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

14 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

14.1 PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL

(18/01804/FULL6) - 9 Princes Avenue, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1QP

Description of application – Demolition of detached garage at rear and erection of single storey side and rear extension.

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

Written comments from Ward Member Councillor Tony Owen in objection to the application were received and circulated to Members.

Supporting documentation was received from the applicant prior to the meeting and circulated to Members. Further objections were received and also circulated.

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Fawthrop, delivered a statement in objection to the application. In particular, he drew Members' attention to the description for the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character. A full copy of the statement and description can be viewed as Annexes A and C to these Minutes.

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

1 The proposal due to the impact of the forward projection of the side extension due to its design and prominence would have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) and would be contrary to Policies BE1, H8 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Draft Policies 37, 4 and 44 of the Draft Local Plan.

**14.2
BROMLEY COMMON AND
KESTON**

**(18/02772/FULL6) - 3 Barnet Drive, Bromley
BR2 8PG**

Description of application – First floor rear extension.

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

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

**14.3
SHORTLANDS**

**(18/02859/FULL6) - 35 Kingswood Avenue,
Shortlands, Bromley BR2 0NT**

Description of application – Single storey front extension to include the conversion of the garage, first floor side/rear extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer.

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

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

**14.4
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(18/02935/FULL6) - 33 Birchwood Road, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1NX

Description of application – First floor side and single storey rear extensions incorporating balcony and raised patio area.

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.

**14.5
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(18/02959/FULL6) - 77 Kingsway, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1PN

Description of application amended to read – ‘Demolition of existing garage, single storey front, part one/two storey rear and two storey side extensions and roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer’.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. Photographic documentation was received from the applicant prior to the meeting and circulated to Members.

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Fawthrop, delivered a statement in objection to the application. In particular, he drew Members’ attention to the description for the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). A full copy of the statement and description can be viewed as Annexes B and C to these Minutes.

The Planning Development Control Manager confirmed that spatial symmetry was an important element of the ASRC.

Councillor Lymer commented that a higher than usual side space was expected in that particular area of Petts Wood.

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

1 The proposed development due to its bulk, size and appearance would have a detrimental impact upon the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) and would also impact upon the appearance and rhythm of the street scene contrary to policies BE1, H8, H9 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Draft Policies 37, 4, 8 and 44 of the Draft Local Plan.

**14.6
MOTTINGHAM AND
CHISLEHURST NORTH**

**(18/03004/FULL6) - Pindi Lodge, Mottingham Lane,
Mottingham SE9 4RW**

Description of application – Roof alterations to incorporate loft conversion to habitable accommodation. Single storey side and front extensions.

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.

15 CONTRAVENTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES

**15.1
PLAISTOW AND
SUNDRIDGE**

Untidy Site - 29 Southover, Bromley BR1 4RU

Members having considered the report **RESOLVED that Direct Action be authorised for a contractor to be employed to carry out work to both the front and rear gardens, to cut back and leave in a maintainable situation.**

**15.2
CLOCK HOUSE**

Untidy Site - 17 Queens Road, Beckenham

Members having considered the report **RESOLVED that Direct Action be authorised for a contractor to be employed to carry out work as detailed in the S215 Notice to tidy both front and rear gardens including the removal of the vehicles to the front.**

The meeting ended at 7.43 pm.

Chairman

COUNCILLOR FAWTHROP'S COMMENTS IN REGARD TO ITEM 1 - 9 PRINCES AVENUE, PETTS WOOD, ORPINGTON

Mr Chairman

At the last Committee meeting the item was deferred to request a change in design of the extension and to move the side element back to fit better within the street scene.

Therefore in relation to this application there is no objection to the proposals at the rear of the property as this will be a major enhancement to the standards and living conditions of the residents of no.9.

From a planning perspective the main issues with this development concern the impact that the projected side extension will have both on the street scene and on the impact upon the Petts Wood ASRC.

Members will have noted the objections from both Cllrs Owen and Onslow in relation to this application along with the appeal decision at 45 Princes Avenue.

The applicant has made a tremendous effort to accommodate these requests, fulfilling the design requirement and stepping inwards the extension at the front adjacent to no.7.

The key element of concern is whether enough has been done to meet the description of the ASRC which deals with rhythm and pattern of an area and I quote.

“The separation between building and the rhythm and pattern of the houses adds to the special character. In many cases there is a much wider separation between houses than in other parts of the Borough which demands a higher degree of separation between buildings to maintain the special character, the openness and feel of the area. Where there are pairs of houses that complement the rhythm of the street scene there is also a prevailing symmetry between the houses. This symmetry can also be seen between neighbouring pairs. The plots are set out in such a way that the spacious character is one of a clear detached and semi-detached nature. “

In this case I believe that the side alterations as currently presented would give rise to a blurring of the lines between what is a detached and a semi-detached house within the street scene, creating a more link detached feel which is does not exist within the Area of Special Residential Character. Making the development out of keeping with the area.

More recently although not a similar application the inspector in the appeal at 1 Priory Avenue, an application recommended for approval by Officers, refused the application paying great store to the appearance of the property within the street scene.

I therefore propose that members refuse this application, on the grounds of BE1, H7 and H10, due to the impact of the forward projection of side extension on the character and appearance of the ASRC.

This page is left intentionally blank

COUNCILLOR FAWTHROP'S COMMENTS IN REGARD TO ITEM 5 - 77 KINGSWAY, PETTS WOOD, ORPINGTON

Mr Chairman

In addressing this application I wanted to share some of the background to The Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC). The description of which has been circulated to you on page 13 of the minutes dates 12th July in the agenda pack.

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

It should be recognised that the applicant has made some welcome changes since the previously refused application 18/00478, namely removing the front roof lights and changes to the rearward design. In addition the side extension adjacent to no.79 has been set back. The question for the committee is whether this is enough to satisfy the previous grounds of refusal. The key element of concern is whether enough has been done to meet the description of the ASRC which deals with rhythm and pattern of an area and I quote.

“The separation between building and the rhythm and pattern of the houses adds to the special character. In many cases there is a much wider separation between houses than in other parts of the Borough which demands a higher degree of separation between buildings to maintain the special character, the openness and feel of the area. Where there are pairs of houses that complement the rhythm of the street scene there is also a prevailing symmetry between the houses. This symmetry can also be seen between neighbouring pairs. The plots are set out in such a way that the spacious character is one of a clear detached and semi-detached nature. “ Just so members are clear this is not an Area of Mediocre Residential Character or an Area of Average Residential Character but an Area of Special Residential Character, where a greater degree of separation is required. Just so members are aware my dictionary definition of special is “distinguished from others in the same category especially because it is in some way superior, it is something that is held in particular esteem.”

So when judging applications in the Petts Wood ASRC there is a very high threshold that applies when considering whether to grant planning permission.

To highlight this point I am enclosing a couple of ASRC appeal decisions which I believe are pertinent to this application, as the inspectors have upheld the spatial standards and the importance of the view from the street scene. They are 1 Priory Avenue and 45 Princes Avenue, both of which have some bearing on this application.

In this instance the application narrows the field of view of the garden of number 77 and hems in the street scene giving a cramped appearance of the street scene. The removal of the garage also removes the symmetry between numbers 77 and 79 on the street scene. The over- hang of the eaves also reduces the side space to less than the minimum of 1M, but in this instance a higher degree of separation is expected, to protect the spacial character of the area.

In this particular instance the proposal does create a detrimental deterioration in the standards of design and separation that would be expected in the ASRC and thus not being in accord with the general character of the area.

Mr Chairman I therefore ask the committee to refusal this application on the grounds of policies H10, H7,H9 and BE1 as well as draft policies 8, 44 and 37 of the Draft Local Plan as the development by its bulk and size and appearance would have a detrimental impact upon character of the ASRC. It would also impact the appearance and rhythm of the street scene.

**PETTS WOOD AREA OF SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER
DESCRIPTION****1.3 Petts Wood:**

The original plans for Petts Wood date from the late 1920s and early 1930s. While Houses were built over a number of years, in a number of similar though varied styles, the road layout and plot sizes were established in an overall pattern. Today the layout remains largely intact. Within the overall area the Conservation Areas of the Chenies and Chislehurst Road already stand out.

The plots were originally designed on the garden suburb principle by developer Basil Scruby, with large plot sizes spaciouly placed. The characteristics of the Petts Wood ASRC include an open feel, predicated by low boundaries and visible front gardens, set back from the road; there is also spaciousness between the houses which is of a superior standard. This allows many of the trees and greenery which prevails throughout the area to be seen from the street scene giving the area its open and semi- rural feel in line with the garden suburb principle. This open and suburban aspect of the area underlines the special characteristic of the area. Development which erodes this principle will be resisted.

The separation between building and the rhythm and pattern of the houses adds to the special character. In many cases there is a much wider separation between houses than in other parts of the Borough which demands a higher degree of separation between buildings to maintain the special character, the openness and feel of the area. Where there are pairs of houses that complement the rhythm of the street scene there is also a prevailing symmetry between the houses. This symmetry can also be seen between neighbouring pairs. The plots are set out in such a way that the spacious character is one of a clear detached and semi-detached nature.

The front building and rear building lines are also of importance in defining the area. The buildings are of a 1930s design which adds to the character of the area. Whilst there have been some changes post war this design aspect of the area remains intact and future development should respect this characteristic. The front roof lines are also of a nature which enhances the characteristic of the area being largely untouched by roof extensions and conversions at the front.

The plot sizes and rear gardens are mostly of a size which is commensurate with the Garden Suburb principle and this characteristic also forms part of the amenity value which makes the area special.

When considering future development within the Petts Wood ASRC, the main focus will be on the impact of any proposed development on the ASRC, taking into account the design and spatial standards including the low density of existing development. Proposals which undermine the character, rhythm, symmetry and spatial standards of the area will be resisted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. Likewise new dwellings proposed on gardens and infill will also be strongly resisted unless very special circumstances can be demonstrated. In this context special is used in the dictionary sense to mean distinguished from others of the same category, because it is in some way superior or held in particular esteem. For a proposal to meet the very special circumstances test in this context would mean not only an enhancement to the ASRC but a consequence of not undertaking the proposal would undermine the Petts Wood ASRC or risk some form of harm to the ASRC.

This page is left intentionally blank