

ITEM 4.16 – (14/04292/FULL6) – GREENWOOD, BICKLEY PARK ROAD, BICKLEY

**COMMENTS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE AND WARD MEMBER
COUNCILLOR KATE LYMER**

For many of you here this is not the first time you have heard me speak against the overdevelopment of Greenwood. The first time was when they wanted to enlarge it to change the use to provide a multiple occupancy dwelling for the Society of African Missions to provide residence for 5 Catholic Priests and guests visiting the Society for short periods of time. Local residents believe that this is still the ultimate aim for applicant, or for a similar development.

The planning report says that the principle of a two-storey side extension has been established as the Inspector 2 appeals ago only refused the application on the grounds of multiple occupancy.

There are however some big differences. Firstly in that application the proposed side extension did not go as far back as this one does.

Secondly, this proposal has a single storey rear extension going along the entire back of the house as well as behind the proposed side extension. The application that the Inspector thought plausible with the 2-storey side extension only had a Conservatory built on to half the length of the rear existing house.

The last application that was approved at Appeal did run along the length of the rear, but only had a single storey side extension.

In a nutshell, this application either by footprint or bulk is larger than either of the last 2 applications.

In front of you I have printed out copies of the Location Plans.

(Wait)

You can clearly tell from this drawing that the proposed dwelling is huge in comparison to its neighbours Jalna, Aldeen and Tile House.

It is completely out of character in size for which I remind you is an Area of Special Residential Character.

This site is a perfect example of overdevelopment by stealth.

This is the 13th planning application from the current owners.

They continually start building work without planning permission, utilising a lot of our enforcement team's time, and just in the last week they have submitted 2 more retrospective applications.

Greenwood was on the market for some time and could not find a buyer, whilst surrounding properties do and did. It is already too big to attract families.

If the suggested work is allowed, the house will be too big for any family to live in.

This proposed dwelling has 15 rooms just on the first floor!

How does the applicant explain that a 4 Bedroom house needs 11 extra rooms on the same floor?

Why does a 4 bedrooms house need 6 en suite bathrooms?

There are 4 dressing rooms proposed and 1 of these dressing rooms is larger than any of the bedrooms.

There is also a Utility room.

Is the intention to convert these extra rooms to bedrooms at a later date?

Any buyer, once the next round of works are completed, will have to change the use of the property to a premises such as hotel, B&B, Cultural Centre etc which is against the Area of Special Residential Character policy. It is just too big to be a family home.

They already have started work on a gym the size of a bungalow, and now they want to add a swimming pool. They have also started work on a pool plant room, without planning permission for it, nor planning permission for a swimming pool that you'd need a pool plant room for.

They have also started building a storeroom in the back garden also without planning permission.

Surely there is limit to how many things need to be constructed in a back garden?

I urge the committee to refuse this application on the basis of its excessive bulk, being a cramped overdevelopment, out of character and denigrating an area of special residential character.