

ITEM 4.5 (18/02048/OUT) - 24 KESWICK ROAD, ORPINGTON, BR6 0EU

Madam Chairman and Members

There is a long history of history of recent proposals at this site and that history forms part of the local knowledge that Councillors use to determine, both the proposal and the motivation for the proposal.

Let's be clear this is not a householder application, it is not a local person seeking to enhance their living accommodation or make better use of the space. This is an application on behalf of a predatory development company, whose sole aim is to maximise profits at the expense of the local character of the area.

The history of this site is laid down on pages 83 and 84 of the report, however what that doesn't pick up is the history of this Company and its developments in the area for example just round the corner at 69 Broomhill Road, two applications by this company to demolish houses and replace them with flats 17/00616 and 17/00618 which have both been refused. Then there is 94 Towncourt Lane, where there are multiple applications by this company all of which have been refused on appeal for flats in place of a family home. The Company have also been refused on appeal with applications at 2 Woodland Way.

This application is nothing more than a Trojan horse designed to get a foothold into the site, in the long tradition of unscrupulous developers they can get permission and then come back with their original intention.

Having said that to put this in context as a planning committee we can give some weight to the living conditions of future occupiers, but have to judge this one in the context of an application on its own merits.

The first thing to note is that this is a 3 Storey development, 2 stories with accommodation in the roof space is actually 3 stories being dressed up as not being 3 stories with intent to deceive. The second thing to note is that this application is so minimally different from the previous application as to be perceptively the same. The reduction is a mere 4.6sq.m. compared with the previous application. When looking at the plans it is of course pure coincidence that the design is symmetrical, which couldn't possibly lead to an application for future segregation into flats.

I'll just point out that all the previous applications on this site were also recommended for permission by Council Officers, and then turned down by members at committee when able to consider the facts and then in the case of the last application dismissed on appeal by the inspector.

When you look at the drawings for this application it is quite clear that it would still be a dominant feature in the street scene undermining the character of the area, the frontage with Stanley Road in particular would be intrusive, harsh and bulky on the appearance and character of the area, as highlighted on page 88 of the report. The application is an over development of the site in this outline form, and not conducive, as already pointed

out, with a householder development to improve their accommodation. The proposals are bulky, cumbersome and a cramped over development, just writing that it isn't in the report, without any evidence doesn't change this fact. The proposals are still set significantly forward from no. 22 Keswick Road which was also a concern for the inspector.

The layout and form of the proposed development are such that this revised scheme would dominate its corner location and would not complement the established pattern of development in the locality, or promote local distinctiveness. The report highlights on page 87 that loss of light would occur to the occupants of number 22 and the negative impact it would have. The report also highlights that there is a loss of amenity to neighbouring properties on page 88. Furthermore the standard of design is poor and not of a quality commensurate with the local vicinity.

To conclude I therefore propose that this be refused on the previous grounds taking into account the inspectors comments that "it has not been demonstrated that the development would meet the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework as it would not take the opportunity to improve the character and quality of the area and the way it functions. Moreover, it would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the UDP and the guidance of Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance No 1 and No 2 (2003). It would not accord with Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan, which seek to ensure new housing development is of a high quality design that enhances the quality of local places.

Councillor Simon Fawthrop
Member for Petts Wood and Knoll
20 September 2018