

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

Application No : 12/01433/FULL1

Ward:
Darwin

Address : Orwell Blackness Lane Keston BR2 6HL

OS Grid Ref: E: 541551 N: 162904

Applicant : Mr B Hazel

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Demolition of existing dwelling and store building and erection of detached single storey 4 bedroom dwelling, formation of new vehicular access and associated landscaping with timber retaining wall.

Key designations:

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

Proposal

It is proposed to demolish the existing bungalow and detached store building and construct a replacement single storey dwelling which would be in the form of two wings connected by an entrance hall.

The existing vehicular access to the site on the southern part of the frontage would be closed off and a new access created further to the north leading to a frontage parking area for 2 vehicles.

Location

This detached bungalow is located on the western side of Blackness Lane within the Green Belt, and occupies a site area of 0.09ha. The bungalow has an L-shape, with an additional flat-roofed structure to the rear and a lean-to which may be additions, although no information has been submitted as to when they were built. A detached shed lies to the rear of the dwelling which appears to be 5m from the lean-to structure.

The site is bounded to the north by the rear gardens of Nos.4 and 5 Orchard Place, which are part two/three storey detached dwellings built on part of the former Keston Fruit Farm, and to the south by an access road.

Comments from Local Residents

No letters of objection have been received in relation to the application.

Comments from Consultees

The Council's highway engineer comments that the site access would have substandard visibility, but given that the scheme comprises a replacement dwelling, it is unlikely to generate significantly more trips than the existing dwelling, therefore, no objections are raised.

Drainage comments suggest that a standard condition be imposed requiring details of surface water drainage to be submitted, while Thames Water raise no objections.

No significant trees on the site would be affected by the proposals

Planning Considerations

The proposal falls to be considered primarily with regard to the following policies:

- BE1 Design of New Development
- H7 Housing Density and Design
- G5 Dwellings in the Green Belt
- T3 Parking
- NE7 Development and Trees

Planning History

Planning permission was granted in 2008 (ref. 08/03233) for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a replacement 3 bedroom bungalow, but this was not implemented and has now lapsed.

Permission was later refused in 2009 (ref. 09/01815) for the demolition of the existing bungalow and the erection of a detached single storey building to be used as a religious meeting hall (Class D1) on grounds relating to inappropriate development in the Green Belt and unacceptable increase in vehicle movements which would be detrimental to road safety.

More recently, permission was refused in March 2012 (ref.11/03590) for the demolition of the existing dwelling and store building, and the erection of a detached single storey 4 bedroom dwelling, the formation of a new vehicular access and associated landscaping with timber retaining wall, on the following grounds:

“The proposed dwelling, by reason of its bulk and scale, and floor area relative to the existing dwelling, constitutes an inappropriate form of development, harmful to the visual amenities and openness of the Green Belt, and contrary to Policies G1 and G5 of the Unitary Development Plan concerning replacement dwellings in the Green Belt.”

No appeal has been lodged to date.

Conclusions

The site is located within the Green Belt, and the main issues are; firstly, whether the proposals comprise inappropriate development, 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.

The main differences between the recently refused and current schemes are:

- the depth of the northern wing would be reduced by 0.2m, resulting in a reduced overall floor area of 1.35sq.m.
- the design of the proposed dwelling would incorporate greater amounts of exposed brickwork, particularly across the front (east) elevation.

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 107.5sq.m. while the outbuilding to be removed (and which lies within 5m of the dwelling) measures 14sq.m., giving a total of 121.5sq.m. The recently refused dwelling would have had a floor area of 136.1sq.m., which was an increase in floor area of 14.6sq.m., and equated to a 12% increase. This would now be reduced by 1.35sq.m. to 134.75sq.m., giving an increase in floor area of 13.25sq.m., which equates to a 10.9% increase.

The replacement dwelling previously permitted under ref. 08/03233 resulted in a floor area of 118.4sq.m. which equated to an increase of 10% (as the existing outbuilding was not included within the calculations), while the current proposals would only marginally increase the floor area. The proposed dwelling would have a lower roofline and less bulky appearance than the dwelling previously permitted, and it has been designed in terms of its layout and use of traditional materials, including exposed brickwork, to give the appearance of traditional farm buildings, and as such, would limit its impact on the open and rural nature of the site.

It is considered, therefore, that the revised proposals would result in an acceptable form of redevelopment which would protect the open and rural nature of the site along with the visual amenities of the surrounding area, and in doing so, would adequately overcome the previous grounds for refusal.

With regard to the impact on neighbouring properties, the replacement dwelling would be sited closer to the boundaries with Nos.4 and 5 Orchard Place than the existing dwelling (1.8m rather than 6m), however, it would remain single storey only and the roof would slope away from the boundaries. Furthermore, the

permitted dwelling maintained only a 1.5m separation at this point. Side windows are mostly confined to the southern elevation adjacent to the access road, and the proposals are not, therefore, considered to be harmful to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on files refs. 08/03233, 09/01815, 11/03590 and 12/01433, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | | | | |
|----|--------|--|-------------------|--|
| 1 | ACA01 | Commencement of development within 3 yrs | | |
| | ACA01R | A01 Reason 3 years | | |
| 2 | ACA04 | Landscaping Scheme - full app no details | | |
| | ACA04R | Reason A04 | | |
| 3 | ACA07 | Boundary enclosure - no detail submitted | | |
| | ACA07R | Reason A07 | | |
| 4 | ACB01 | Trees to be retained during building op. | | |
| | ACB01R | Reason B01 | | |
| 5 | ACB02 | Trees - protective fencing | | |
| | ACB02R | Reason B02 | | |
| 6 | ACB03 | Trees - no bonfires | | |
| | ACB03R | Reasons B03 | | |
| 7 | ACB04 | Trees - no trenches, pipelines or drains | | |
| | ACB04R | Reason B04 | | |
| 8 | ACC01 | Satisfactory materials (ext'nl surfaces) | | |
| | ACC01R | Reason C01 | | |
| 9 | ACD02 | Surface water drainage - no det. submitt | | |
| | ADD02R | Reason D02 | | |
| 10 | ACH03 | Satisfactory parking - full application | | |
| | ACH03R | Reason H03 | | |
| 11 | ACH09 | Restriction on height to front and flank | | |
| | ACH09R | Reason H09 | | |
| 12 | ACH24 | Stopping up of access | | |
| | ACH24R | Reason H24 | | |
| 13 | ACH29 | Construction Management Plan | | |
| | ACH29R | Reason H29 | | |
| 14 | ACH32 | Highway Drainage | | |
| | ADH32R | Reason H32 | | |
| 15 | ACI02 | Rest of "pd" Rights - Class A, B,C and E | | |
| | ACI03R | Reason I03 | | |
| 16 | ACI17 | No additional windows (2 inserts) northern flank northern wing of the dwelling | | |
| | ACI17R | I17 reason (1 insert) BE1 | | |
| 17 | ACK02 | No mezz floor/roof space accom (1in) to provide habitable accommodation | a mezzanine floor | |
| | ACK02R | K02 reason (1 insert) G5 | | |
| 18 | ACK04 | Demolition of existing building (see D10) | | |

- | | | |
|----|--------|--------------------------|
| | ACK04R | K04 reason |
| 19 | ACK06 | Slab levels - compliance |
| | ACK06R | K06 reason |

Reasons for permission:

In granting permission the Local Planning Authority had regard to the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

- BE1 Design of New Development
- H7 Housing Density and Design
- G5 Dwellings in the Green Belt
- T3 Parking
- NE7 Development and Trees

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

- (a) the character and appearance of the development within the surrounding area
- (b) the impact of the development on the amenities of nearby residential properties
- (c) the impact of the development on the open nature of the Green Belt

and having regard to all other matters raised, including neighbours concerns.

INFORMATIVE(S)

- 1 RDI16 Contact Highways re. crossover
- 2 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

Application:12/01433/FULL1

Address: Orwell Blackness Lane Keston BR2 6HL

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and store building and erection of detached single storey 4 bedroom dwelling, formation of new vehicular access and associated landscaping with timber retaining wall.

