

## **Section '4' - Applications recommended for REFUSAL or DISAPPROVAL OF DETAILS**

**Application No :** 16/02576/FULL1

**Ward:**  
Farnborough And Crofton

**Address :** 1 Meadow Way Orpington BR6 8LN

**OS Grid Ref:** E: 543046 N: 165227

**Applicant :** Mr Bali Ghuman

**Objections :** YES

### **Description of Development:**

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement detached four bedroom dwelling with integral garage, swimming pool, loft spaces and associated landscaping

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Farnborough Park  
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area  
London City Airport Safeguarding  
Smoke Control SCA 11

### **Proposal**

The proposal is for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement detached dwelling with integral garage, habitable accommodation in the loft space and indoor swimming pool. The proposed dwelling would have a maximum width of 16.5m and an overall length of 24m. the dwelling would have a pitched part flat roof with two levels having a height of between 9.8m and 9.2m and would be hipped. Additionally, five side rooflights and one rear rooflight are proposed.

### **Location**

The application site is set on the northern edge of Meadow Way approximately 35m east of Elm Walk and comprises a detached two storey dwellinghouse. The surrounding area is characterised by individually designed dwellings set in open spacious plots and forms part of the Farnborough Park Conservation Area.

### **Consultations**

Nearby owners/occupiers were notified of the application and representations were received which can be summarised as follows:

- More similar to the first refused application (ref. 12/02637)
- Proposal ignores issues addressed in the permitted scheme (13/00525)

- Previous issues in refused scheme are still relevant in the current proposal
- Overdevelopment of the site
- Raised terrace would lead to total loss of amenities to No. 3
- Water tables are extremely high in the park in particular around the site
- 31 The Glen would suffer from infilling and would increase the flooding problem
- Surface area of roofs would require huge soak away capacity
- Soil is high plasticity clay which is impervious
- potential flood risk from rainwater runoff
- Limited rear garden would remain for soak away
- would not meet building control fire regulations
- concern regarding extent/size of development
- Development would be 599sqm and 3x size of original property
- Indoor pool and raised terrace would create excessive bulk
- Pool and terrace would occupy 2/3 of the garden
- Loss of garden, lawn area and trees which provide screening
- Raised terrace would destroy privacy in rear garden of No. 3
- Loss of light

### **Consultee Comments**

Drainage - the site is within an area where in which the Environment Agency - Thames Water Region require restriction on the rate of discharge of surface water from new development into the river Ravensbourne or its tributaries therefore a standard condition is recommended.

The Council's Environmental Health Officer would have no objection to the proposal in principle subject to a recommended condition and informative.

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas (APCA) inspected the application and object to the application due to the footprint and scale of the building being too large for the site and the quality of the architectural design and needs to be much improved to comply with policies BE1 and BE11 and the relevant Conservation Area SPG. The current proposal would not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area.

No technical Highways objections to the proposal as Meadow Way is on a private road and the proposed access and parking appear satisfactory and the Council's Highways team would have no comments on the proposal.

### **Planning Considerations**

The application falls to be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development  
 BE11 Conservation Areas  
 H7 Housing Design

H9 Side Space  
T3 Parking  
NE7 Development and Trees

## The Farnborough Park Supplementary Planning Guidance

London Plan 2015:

Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply.  
Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential  
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments  
Policy 3.8 Housing choice  
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation  
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions  
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction  
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy  
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling  
Policy 5.10 Urban greening  
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs  
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management  
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage  
Policy 5.14 Water quality and wastewater Infrastructure  
Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies  
Policy 6.9 Cycling  
Policy 6.13 Parking  
Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment  
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime  
Policy 7.4 Local character  
Policy 7.6 Architecture  
Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology  
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

Housing SPG (2016)

NPPF

Technical Housing Standards (2015)

### **Planning history**

A single storey side extension (replacement garage) was approved under reference 97/03131/FUL.

A similar proposal to this scheme for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement detached four bedroom dwelling with integral garage was refused under Refs 12/02637/FULL1 and 12/02644/CAC for the following reasons

1. The proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of its size, height, bulk and site coverage, would constitute a cramped form of development, resulting in the erosion of existing side space leading to a harmful impact on the spacious

character and appearance of the Farnborough Park Conservation Area, contrary to Policies BE1, BE11, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2. The proposed replacement dwelling would, by reason of its excessive bulk and rearward projection close to the boundaries, would result in a loss of prospect that occupiers of the adjacent dwelling, Orchard Cottage, might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

3. The proposed replacement dwelling, by reason of its unimaginative design, would result in a building of insufficient quality that would detract from the character and appearance of the Farnborough Park Conservation Area, contrary to Policies BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan.

There is a corresponding Conservation Area consent application for the demolition of the existing dwelling under reference 12/02644/CAC.

A subsequent application was granted planning permission under ref. 13/00525/FULL1 and 13/00527/CAC for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a replacement detached dwelling with integral garage and loft space.

## **Conclusions**

The main issues relating to the application are the effect that it would have on the character of the area and the impact that it would have on the amenities of the occupants of surrounding residential properties.

As in the previously permitted scheme (ref. 13/00525), in terms of its design, the proposed dwelling is considered to be an improvement on the previous refusal (ref. 12/02637). It would have a projecting central two storey gable end portico which responds to the horseshow drive. Its layout would respect the established building line of the area and is set 2m off each side boundary at two storey level and 1m in part at single storey level and in effect, mirrors the form of no.3 Meadow Way. The site is wider than 3 Meadow Way.

Whilst there is undoubtedly a need to ensure good design, Farnborough Park Conservation Area has been compromised to a degree due to the range of large detached properties of varying design erected over the years. The architectural design proposed here is similar to the previously permitted scheme (ref. 13/00525) more modest than the previously refused application and better relates to the massing, scale and design of other properties in the locality. For these reason the proposal is considered to overcome the refusal reasons 1 and 3 of the previous application (ref. 12/02637).

The other reason for refusal related to the 'excessive bulk and rearward projection close to the boundaries, would result in a loss of prospect that occupiers of the adjacent dwelling, Orchard Cottage'. The previously granted scheme (13/00525) had been amended to set back the first floor west side rear elevation to maintain a 20m distance to the rear of Orchard Cottage.

In the current proposal however, revised plans were received reducing the depth and bulk of the proposed indoor pool extension by initially by 2m (received 20/07/2016) then later revised plans was received on 11/08/2016 with a further reduction by 5m. Although it would continue to have a substantial depth, the single storey element having a depth of 10.6m which is excessive, and therefore the reduction would not be considered sufficient to alleviate its visual impact in view of its bulk on the neighbouring properties, in particular Orchard Cottage as it would continue to extend for most of the rear boundary line of this neighbouring property resulting in a high brick wall in close proximity to the boundary and rear amenity space. This neighbouring property backs onto the site and has a wide garden however the depth to the rear boundary is quite modest and it will be situated at a minimum distance of 11.5m from the flank wall of the proposed dwelling. As the proposal would result in a total depth of the property of 24m which is more than 3 times the length of the existing property (the original length being 7.6m) and would be situated only 1m from the boundary with Orchard Cottage, it is considered that the proposal would result in an overbearing visual impact and sense of enclosure from the rear garden of Orchard Cottage and would be seriously detrimental to the ability of the current and future occupiers of this neighbouring property to enjoy the rear outdoor amenity space.

To the east, No. 3 the first floor and single storey rear building line which is immediately adjacent to this boundary would not project beyond the rear elevation of this neighbouring property. The proposed swimming pool element would project 5.4m to the rear of its rear building line, however it would be situated at a distance of 14.2m to the proposed pool single storey projection which would provide an adequate separation to prevent a harmful loss of outlook, privacy and prospect for this neighbouring property.

Objections have been received with concerns regarding the potential flood risk resulting from the amount of the development proposed including its rear paved terrace. From a drainage point of view, the site is situated within an area where the Environment Agent - Thames water require a restriction on the rate of discharge of surface water from new development into the river Ravensbourne or its tributaries but it is considered that this can be dealt with by way of a condition if permission was forthcoming.

There are windows at first floor both flank elevations overlook towards No.3 Meadow Way and Orchard Cottage. The first floor windows on each flank serve bathroom/ dressing rooms and could be conditioned obscure glazed and fixed should Members consider granting planning permission.

Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed is not acceptable in that it would not result in a significant loss of amenity to local residents.

**RECOMMENDATION: APPLICATION BE REFUSED  
as amended by documents received on 11.08.2016**

**The reasons for refusal are:**

- 1 The proposed replacement dwelling would, by reason of its excessive bulk and rearward projection close to the boundary, would result in an overbearing visual impact sense of enclosure and loss of outlook and prospect that occupiers of the adjacent dwelling, Orchard Cottage, Elm Walk might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.**