

MINUTE ANNEX

APPENDIX A

ITEM 14.5 – (13/02391/FULL6) – 12 GREAT THRIFT, PETTS WOOD

REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED BY

WARD MEMBER, COUNCILLOR SIMON FAWTHROP

In addressing this application I wanted to share some of the background to The Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC).

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 quality suburb emulating the garden suburb movement and it is this heritage which the ASRC designation seeks to conserve for future generations.

Many of these references are contained within the ASRC policy H10 which refers specifically in para 4.49 to protect against unsympathetic development which would threaten the established character and residential amenity.

These standards are set out in Appendix I of the UDP.

In particular para 1.2 (i) states that developments likely to erode the quality and character of the ASRC shall be resisted. And (ii) residential density shall accord with that existing in the area. (vii) new development will be expected to take account of existing front and rear building lines. On page 37 of the committee report you will notice that this development projects 1 metre beyond the rear building line in contravention of this very strict ASRC policy. Whilst the report mentions impact upon the neighbours, there is a gapping omission in the impact this has on the ASRC.

The report tries to cite previous examples of elements being allowed. However this is a definite case of two wrongs not making a right. This application when considered on its own undermines the ASRC contrary to policy H10. In addition this is an impact in particular on the residential amenity of no. 10 Great Thrift contrary to policy BE1. But also contrary to policy H10 which is implied in the general standards of the area.

The previous refusal under ref 13/01415 did not to my knowledge come before members and may have been dealt with under delegated authority meaning that it did not come under the full scrutiny that it would had it been presented to committee.

Taking this application on its own merits, we can, as democratically elected members, using our local knowledge scrutinise this application in detail and look at the merits or otherwise of this application.

Along with case law on planning we must accept that precedents are not set by previous applications whether approved or refused.

In this particular instance the proposal whilst not creating a terrace does have a terracing effect, it reduces the spatial standards and narrows the street scene which allows views of the magnificent trees that populate the rear gardens in the Petts Wood ASRC. This is part and parcel of the character and nature of the area which exists to have a suburban setting with a rural feel. So is also contrary to policy H8 which refers to the design and density of an area. If member agree with me that this is contrary to policy H10 then I hope they will agree that it is also contrary to policy H8.

Mr Chairman I therefore propose refusal on the grounds of policies H10, H8 and BE1.