

ITEM 4.5 (17/02535/RECON) – 10 WOOD RIDE, PETTS WOOD, BR5 1PX

Madam Chairman

The applications before you tonight for 10 Wood Ride falls within the both the Chislehurst Road Conservation Area and the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC), which was designed and built on the Garden Suburb principle.

Before I commence on a detailed response I'd like to draw to your attention some inaccuracies within the report. The first being that no reference is made to the ASRC anywhere within the report. The planning history also fails to report the withdrawn application 16/03728 which is substantially the same application that is before you tonight. This means that the plans are also subject to saved UDP policy H10 and the draft policy 44 of our new Local Development Plan.

Also no reference is made to the existing Petts Wood ASRC description, which I attach a copy for the minutes or the proposed ASRC description in Appendix 10.6 of the proposed Draft Local Plan which I also include a copy for an understanding of the impact that this proposal would have upon this Special Area.

It is also worth noting that there are two Article 4 directions in place, one around the front boundary treatment to preserve the low level open feel and a second around the front roof line to preserve the appearance of the Area and maintain standards.

The current UDP Appendix 1 paragraph 1.2 (Copy attached) makes it quite clear that new developments

- (i) **Will be resisted if they erode the quality and character of the ASRC, in respect of the ASRC description.**
- (ii) **Residential density shall accord with that in the area**
- (iii) **Spatial standards of new development (plot, width, garden depth and plot ratio shall accord with the general pattern in the area.**

These are just some of the guidelines that I have identified that this application breaches.

The fact is that the Petts Wood ASRC is one of only two similar areas in London the other being Hampstead Garden Suburb, which are of such an important quality that development cannot be a free for all. There are many examples of inspectors looking at the ASRC and recognising its importance, I am attaching four examples for you the first is in the same Conservation Area at 267 Chislehurst Road, and this points out that even if something can't be seen it can still do harm to the Character of the area.

The second is in The Conservation Area of the Chenies which was dismissed which demonstrates that an application can be a cramped overdevelopment of the site and harmful to spatial standards.

The 3rd is in relation to an application in the same road to demonstrate that inspectors uphold the areas character nearby.

The final appeal relates to an end plot in Ladywood Avenue which is by the same applicant to demonstrate that this is no ordinary householder appeal but something more commercial and systematic. The appeal again demonstrates that the spatial character and standards are very important.

One thing is clear, when the plots were established in Petts Wood it was for family housing with generous plot sizes and gardens as well as garages. By introducing basement development into the Conservation Area and ASRC this application completely undermines the notion of the Garden Suburb. The Garden Suburb does not have basements. This so severely erodes the Conservation Area and ASRC as to cause considerable and irreversible harm for current and future occupiers of the site and area.

The application increases the density out of all proportion to the plot size. It is also likely to cause considerable harm to the Noel Rees designed building in the Conservation Area and during any construction the adjoining occupiers would have an unacceptable deterioration in their Residential amenity.

Finally Madam Chairman I'd like to propose the following grounds for refusal.

- 1) The application is contrary to policy H10 Appendix 1 paragraph 1.2(i) in that the development erodes the individual quality and character of the ASRC in that it introduces basement developments into the both the Conservation Area and ASRC when none currently exist, severely eroding the nature and Character of the area.
- 2) The application is contrary to policy BE11 in that it does not respect or compliment the layout scale, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces, nor does it respect and incorporate the design, existing landscape or other features that contribute to the Character, appearance or historic value of the Chislehurst Road Conservation Area in that there are no basements existing with the conservation area.
- 3) The density exceeds that in the surrounding area in breach of policy H7 table 4.2 and H10 Appendix 1 paragraph 1.2 (ii) residential density shall accord with that existing in the area
- 4) The proposal by reason of the introduction of a basement, represents a cramped over development of the site out of character and harmful to the spatial standards of the Chislehurst Road Conservation Area contrary to policy BE1, BE11, H8 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.
- 5) BE12