

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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