

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 20 September 2018

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Charles Joel (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Gareth Allatt, Katy Boughey, Mark Brock,
Simon Fawthrop, Kira Gabbert, Simon Jeal and Suraj Sharma

Also Present:

Councillors David Jefferys

10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Tony Owen and Will Rowlands and Councillors Simon Fawthrop and Gareth Allatt attended as their substitutes respectively.

11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest reported.

12 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 26 JULY 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2018 be confirmed.

13 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

13.1 FARNBOROUGH AND CROFTON CONSERVATION AREA

(17/05263/FULL1) - Rear of 3 Church Road, Farnborough, BR6 7DB
Description of application – Demolition of existing commercial outbuildings and erection of two storey, one bedroom detached dwelling, use of commercial Listed Building as ancillary to new dwelling and associated landscaping.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

Comments from Ward Member, Councillor Robert Evans, in objection to the application were reported and circulated to Members.

Ward Member, Councillor Charles Joel, referred to the drawings and was concerned with the proposed siting in relation to the adjoining property and in his view the narrow access to Flat 3 would be unsuitable for further parking where traffic was heavy with difficult site lines and he objected to the application and he also reported that Farnborough Village Society objected to the application.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED AGAINST THE CHIEF PLANNER'S RECOMMENDATION** on the grounds that:-

1. The proposal would result in a cramped form of backland development and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).
2. The proposal would have insufficient parking contrary to Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

13.2 CHISLEHURST CONSERVATION AREA

(18/02500/FULL1) - Bank House, 11 High Street, Chislehurst, BR7 5AB

Description of application – Change of use of vacant former bank premises (A2 use) to a drinking establishment (A4 use) incorporating introduction of extract system to rear of property.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that a further letter of support had been received.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report of the Chief Planner with two further conditions to read:-
“8. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no operational works or changes of use permitted by Part 1, Part 2 or Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended), shall be erected or made without the prior approval in writing

of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to comply with Policies BE1, S4 and S9 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interests of residential amenity.

9. The rear garden area shown on the site block plan as a "Resident garden" shall not be used at any time by customers of the use hereby permitted.

REASON: In order to comply with Policies BE1, S4 and S9 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interests of residential amenity."

**13.3
WEST WICKHAM**

(18/03136/FULL6) - 77 The Crescent, West Wickham, BR4 0HD

Description of application – First floor front side extension and hip to gable roof with rear dormer.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. Further objections and photographs from the neighbour had been received and circulated to Members.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

**13.4
BICKLEY**

(18/00536/FULL1) - 55 Liddon Road, Bromley, BR1 2SR.

Description of application - Erection of additional floor to provide four new units; 1 x 2-bed and 3 x 1-bed. External alterations to existing building to include new windows, doors, and private terraces.

Ward Member, Councillor Kira Gabbert, expressed her and her Ward colleagues' dissatisfaction at the relevant change-of-office-to-residential-use legislation which led to this kind of inappropriate development to be allowed in the first place. Although she welcomed the reduction in units, in her opinion the proposed development remained ill-suited for the location and she abstained from the vote.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the

conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**13.5
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(18/02048/OUT) - 24 Keswick Road, Orpington BR6
0EU**

Description of application – Demolition of existing dwelling and detached garage and erection of detached two storey 6 bedroom single family dwellinghouse including accommodation in the roof with associated access and parking spaces (Outline application for access, appearance and landscaping).

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Ward Member, Councillor Simon Fawthrop, referred to his local knowledge and read a statement and requested it be annexed to these minutes with appeal decision (APP/G5180/W/17/3180183) dated 4 December 2017 ('Annex A'). Further objections from local residents had been received by Councillor Fawthrop, and circulated to Members.

The Chief Planner's representative reported that further objections to the application had been received together with comments from the Tree Officer.

The Chairman and Councillor Joel accepted the principle of redevelopment on the site but objected to the application being an overdevelopment.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED AGAINST THE CHIEF PLANNER'S RECOMMENDATION** on the grounds that:-

1. The proposed building by reason of its close proximity to No. 22 Keswick Road and excessive size, bulk and rearward projection would appear overbearing and result in loss of light to and outlook from the neighbouring property at No.22 Keswick Road and its rear garden, detrimental to the amenities of the adjoining occupiers, and thereby contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed two storey dwelling with accommodation in the roof space would be an overly dominant and incongruous form of development on this prominent corner plot which would be cramped and overdeveloped and out of keeping; harmful to street scene and the character of the area contrary to

Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan, adopted SPG1 and SPG2, Policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan, the London Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework.

**13.6
BICKLEY**

(18/02287/FULL1) - 102 Nightingale Lane, Bromley, BR1 2SE

Description of application – Erection of part subterranean detached 3 bedroom dwelling with associated access road at land at rear of 102 Nightingale Lane (Revision to application ref: 14/01887/FULL1 to include increased accommodation at the lower level beneath the garden level terrace).

Ward Member, Councillor Gabbert, speaking on behalf of all Bickley Ward members, considered the proposed development to be backland development of the worst kind. Notwithstanding that the current application was seeking a relatively minor alteration to the previously approved plans, she objected to the application and abstained from the vote. If the application were permitted she expected Building Control Division to carefully monitor the building process and ensure the development be constructed in accordance with Building Regulations and the approved plans.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with an informative to read:-

“INFORMATIVE: The Applicant is advised that Members of the Committee suggested that the Council’s Building Control be notified of the start of works if they are not the appointed Inspector.”

**13.7
CRAY VALLEY WEST**

(18/02736/FULL6) - 37 Marion Crescent, Orpington, BR5 2DF

Description of application - Part one/two storey rear extension, roof alterations to include side dormers, front porch and elevational alterations including front bay window.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Councillor Joel had visited the site and supported the application. Councillors Fawthrop and Simon Jeal had concerns at the loss of daylight and the impact on the residential amenity on 35 Marion Crescent.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED AGAINST THE CHIEF PLANNER'S RECOMMENDATION** on the grounds that:-

1. The proposed extension would have a detrimental effect on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers at No. 35 Marion Crescent, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policies 6 and 37 of the Emerging Local Plan (2016).

**13.8
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

(18/02956/FULL1) - 2 Kechill Gardens, Hayes, Bromley BR2 7NQ.

Description of application – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 1 three bedroom detached dwelling and associated works.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner with a further condition to read:-

“14. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no change of use of any kind permitted by Class L (Houses of Multiple Occupation) of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended), shall be undertaken within the curtilage of the dwelling without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To enable the Council to consider future development at the site in the interest of local amenity, in accordance with policies BE1 and H11 of the Unitary Development Plan.”

**13.9
CRAY VALLEY EAST**

(18/02984/FULL6) - 61 Chelsfield Road, Orpington, BR5 4DS

Description of application – Two storey side addition and vehicular crossover.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the

Chief Planner.

**13.10
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(18/02990/FULL6) - 9A Irene Road, Orpington, BR6 0HA

Description of application – Garden shed
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION.

Ward Member, Councillor Simon Fawthrop, read a statement in objection to the application and requested it be annexed to these minutes ('Annex B'). Councillor Gabbert also objected to the application.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE REFUSED AGAINST THE CHIEF PLANNER'S RECOMMENDATION** on the grounds that:-

1. The proposal by reason of its bulk, size and siting would have a detrimental effect on the amenities of the neighbouring dwellings, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and Policies 6 and 37 of the Emerging Local Plan (2016).

IT WAS FURTHER RESOLVED THAT ENFORCEMENT ACTION BE AUTHORISED FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE GARDEN SHED.

**13.11
WEST WICKHAM**

(18/03273/PLUD) - 166 Langley Way, West Wickham, BR4 0DT

Description of application – Single storey rear extension. Lawful Development Certificate (Proposed).

THIS REPORT WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE CHIEF PLANNER.

**13.12
FARNBOROUGH AND
CROFTON
CONSERVATION AREA**

(18/03282/FULL1) - 8-10 Church Road, Farnborough, Orpington, BR6 7DB

Description of application – Single storey rear extension and new shopfronts.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Comments from Ward Member, Councillor Robert Evans, in objection to the application were reported and circulated to Members. Councillor Joel reported that Farnborough Village Society objected to the

application.

The Chief Planner's representative reminded Members that the application only related to the ground floor level and shop fronts.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with two further conditions and an informative to read:-
"6. Details of the proposed shopfront design (including fascia and doors) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

7. The southeast flank elevation of the rear extension hereby permitted shall be painted white and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

INFORMATIVE: It is advisable that the postal number be clearly displayed on the frontage of the property."

**13.13
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(18/03298/FULL6) - 63 Towncourt Crescent, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1PH

Description of application - Half hip to gable loft conversion to match adjoining property - with rear dormers and front roof lights and elevational alterations.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that the application had been amended by documents received on 12 September 2018.

Ward Member, Councillor Simon Fawthrop, had circulated an appeal decision (APP/G5180/D/18/3201523) dated 19 July 2018 relating to 1 Priory Avenue, Petts Wood, together with the description of the Area of Special Residential Character.

Councillors Joel had visited the site and he and Councillor Jeal supported the application.

Members having considered the report and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with two further conditions to read:-

“5. The roof light windows hereby permitted shall be conservation roof light windows, they shall fit flush to the underpinning roof tiles and shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

6. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no change of use of any kind permitted by Class L (Houses of Multiple Occupation) of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended), shall be undertaken within the curtilage of the dwelling without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To enable the Council to consider future development at the site in the interest of local amenity, in accordance with policies BE1 and H11 of the Unitary Development Plan.”

**13.14
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(18/03409/FULL1) - Jason, Yester Road,
Chislehurst, BR7 5HN**

Description of application – Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a three storey pair of semidetached dwellings with accommodation in roof space (RETROSPECTIVE).

It was reported that objections from The Chislehurst Society had been received.

Ward Member, Councillor Katy Boughey, referred to the history of the site and was concerned with the degree of overlooking from the dormer window, the outside staircase, the unbalanced effect and the future potential of the proposed development. Councillors Joel, Fawthop and the Chairman also objected to the application.

Councillor Suraj Sharma supported the application.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE REFUSED AGAINST THE CHIEF PLANNER'S RECOMMENDATION** on the grounds that:-

1. The proposed development by reason of its scale, mass, bulk and design in a prominent location would appear unbalanced and harmful to the visual amenities of the Conservation Area contrary to Policies BE1, BE11 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proximity of the proposed development to neighbouring properties and its size and height would lead to an unacceptably harmful relationship detrimental to amenities of neighbouring properties contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

**13.15
PLAISTOW AND
SUNDRIDGE**

(18/03513/FULL6) - 3 Hansom Terrace, Freelands Grove, Bromley, BR1 3NL

Description of application – Roof alterations incorporating rear dormer and front and rear rooflights and elevational alterations, insertion of high rise window on the flank wall.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

SECTION 4

(Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

**13.16
BROMLEY COMMON AND
KESTON**

(18/00871/FULL1) - Keston Parish Church, Church Road, Keston

Description of application – The enlargement of the existing car park for Keston Parish Church and Church Hall.

Oral representations in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor David Jefferys, in support of the application were received at the meeting. Councillor Jefferys also spoke on behalf of his fellow Ward Member, Councillor Robert Mcilveen. Councillor Jefferys informed the Sub-Committee that

there was wide support in the community for the enlargement of the carpark so long as road safety was addressed and that it would enhance the green belt and tidy the site.

Supplementary information from the applicant had been received and circulated to Members.

The Chief Planner's representative said that the applicant has indicated he would be prepared to change the proposed car park material to reinforced grass mesh to reduce its visual impact, and had confirmed that the proposed development was for a parking annex, ancillary to the main parking area.

The Chairman said that for a development of this nature very special circumstances would have to be established that would not harm the Green Belt. Currently the carpark was inadequate for the use of the Church and Hall and people were forced to park on the narrow lanes which was a favourite for cyclists and pedestrians, being a road safety hazard. The Chairman welcomed the proposed change of material to a permeable surface and stressed that site was untidy with some dead and diseased trees and rubbish and that the proposed annex would enhance the area and suggested that a road safety audit be undertaken.

Councillor Fawthrop was aware of traffic congestion in the area and supported the change of material and suggested that if permission were to be granted at a later stage, a personal planning condition for Church use only should be considered.

As trees were proposed to be removed Councillor Mark Brock suggested that the applicant inform the Council of its proposals for the replanting of trees.

Members having considered the report and representations, **RESOLVED that THE APPLICATION BE DEFERRED**, without prejudice to any future consideration, on Section 2 of the agenda of a future meeting of the Plans Sub-Committee for a road safety audit report and tree planting details to be submitted.

**KESTON
CONSERVATION AREA**

Description of application – Part one/two storey side/rear extensions, loft conversion including hip to gable extensions, rear dormer extension and front rooflights.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received at the meeting. Supplementary information and photographs from the objector had been received and circulated to Members. It was reported that on page 234 of the Chief Planner's report the third paragraph should be amended to read, "Having regard to the form, scale and siting it is considered that the proposed extensions would not complement the host property and would appear out of character with surrounding development or the area generally."

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reasons set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

MINUTE ANNEX A - Councillor Simon Fawthrop's representations relating to Item 4.5 24 Keswick Road, Orpington
MINUTE ANNEX 'B' - Councillor Simon Fawthrop's representations relating to 9a Irene Road, Orpington, BR6 0HA

The Meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chairman

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



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2017

by **Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4th December 2017

Appeal Ref: **APP/G5180/W/17/3180183** **24 Keswick Road, Orpington BR6 0EU**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Rafael Porzycki of Aventier Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bromley.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01588/OUT, dated 30 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "demolition of one existing residential dwelling and erection of 2 semi-detached houses with accommodation on roof level associated access and 4 parking spaces at 24 Keswick Road, BR6 0EU".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was made in outline and sought approval for access, landscaping and layout. Details of appearance and scale were reserved for subsequent approval. Consequently, I have treated the Floors Plans (Ref BX08-S2-104, Elevations 1 (Ref BX08-S2-105) and Elevations 2 (Ref BX08-S2-106) as indicative.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on: (i) the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with regard to outlook and light, and; (ii) the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The site layout plan shows that the development would extend beyond the rear wall of the neighbouring house at No 22 Keswick Road. Due to its siting and form, the proposed two-storey development would have a greater impact on the adjoining property than the existing bungalow. I saw from my site visit that No 22 has a rear ground floor window to a main habitable room that would be particularly affected by the development.
5. I have considered the appellant's sun/shadow report, which indicates that there would be a loss of sunlight to the rear of the neighbouring property, especially in the early afternoon during the spring and winter months. This would be

greater than the shadow cast by the existing bungalow. Also, the relatively long side wall of the proposed two-storey development would be more dominant and it would adversely affect the outlook from the rear of No 22.

6. The combination of the loss of light and outlook would have a material adverse effect on living conditions to the detriment of the neighbour's enjoyment of their property. Therefore, the development would be contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) which, amongst other things, seek to protect the amenity of occupiers of adjoining buildings.

Character and Appearance

7. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner location at the junction of Keswick Road and Stanley Road. The surrounding area is residential, characterised by predominately detached houses set within spacious plots, which gives an open appearance. The land levels fall away from west to east, with the result that the appeal property sits at a higher level than the road, and the houses opposite.
8. The existing dwelling is a detached chalet style bungalow with dormer windows. Although smaller in scale than other houses nearby, it is highly visible in the street scene due to its corner location and elevated position. It's siting closer to the northern boundary, and the angled orientation, enables the bungalow to blend into the street scene and complement the open and spacious character and appearance of the area.
9. The proposed development is for the demolition of the existing bungalow and its replacement with a pair of semi-detached houses, which would require the sub-division of the plot. The development would be positioned squarely within the site, fronting onto Keswick Road. It would be significantly further forward than the existing bungalow and it would be considerably more prominent in the street scene. I appreciate that matters of scale and design are reserved for subsequent approval. Nonetheless, it is clear from the application that a two-storey building is sought, with accommodation in the roofspace. The proposed semi-detached houses would be incongruous and would stand-out as an overly prominent and uncharacteristic form of development in this location.
10. I have taken into account the scale of other development in the vicinity, especially No 22 which is a substantial property. However, No 22 is not in a prominent corner location. Similarly, No 1 Stanley Road, opposite the appeal site, is well screened and is sited at a lower level than the road. Despite being a large house, it also complements the street scene. The appellant has assessed plot sizes and the separation between properties in Keswick Road. Whilst this shows that the plot size in itself would be comparable with development in the immediate vicinity, the assessment takes no account of the site-specific circumstances and the fact that the appeal site is prominent in the street scene.
11. The layout and form of the proposed development are such that it would dominate its corner location and would not complement the established pattern of development in the locality, or promote local distinctiveness. The landscaping scheme would be unlikely to screen the two-storey development and, in any event, it would take some time to mature. Consequently, I am not satisfied that it would mitigate the adverse effects of the proposal.

12. To conclude on this matter, 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.

Conclusion

13. I have taken into account the benefits of the development, including that it would make a minor contribution to the local housing supply, and it would be reasonably well located in relation to transport options and access to facilities. However, the benefits are limited and do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector

This page is left intentionally blank

ITEM 4.10 (18/02990/FULL6) - 9A IRENE ROAD, ORPINGTON, BR6 0HA

Madam Chairman and Members

When permission was granted in December 2014 for this dwelling, condition 6 removed permitted development rights for outbuildings etc.

I was party to that decision in 2014 and indeed was the proposer of that condition.

There were essentially two reasons for this the first and most obvious was to protect the outlook of surrounding residents. The second whilst related was similar in that due to the positioning of the land it was to help protect residential amenity, particularly with regard to water runoff from the surrounding area impacting properties in both Sequoia Gardens and Novar Close.

This is the second retrospective application in relation to garden sheds put in by the owner.

In this context it is by belief that this application due to its bulk size and siting is detrimental to the outlook and amenities of nearby residents, it is also clear that this is close to t in which the application is received. It also has to be taken in context of the development which took place at no. 61 Towncourt Crescent next door. If this application was again taken in the context of no. 63 being typical of the Area of Special Residential Character then again the recommendation to grant permission would be a good one.

I therefore propose that the application be refused.

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

This page is left intentionally blank