

ITEM 4.10 (19/03187/FULL1) – 54 STATION ROAD, ORPINGTON

COMMENTS AND PHOTOGRAPHS FROM WARD MEMBER, COUNCILLOR WILLIAM HUNTINGTON-THRESHER IN OBJECTION

No one would suggest that this site so close to the station is not developable, and a development that also retains the commercial element is to be praised in that respect. However this is not the development for this site as it contradicts LBB's Local Plan. The committee report lays out the reasons it is considered an overdevelopment but I would contend the following also need addressing for an appropriate development to emerge

Below are two photo montages provided by the applicant. The photos show that the development will result in an overly dominant development inconsistent with the street scene opposite and down the hill. These montages have been taken to emphasis the modern development on one side but not the more characterful properties along Station Road and partially visible in the second photo. The triangular site shape and avoiding the protected trees has resulted in a overdevelopment of this site and an overly dominant development

I would support all the reasons for refusal related to the overly dominant nature of the development which is also out of character for the area – contrary to LBB Policy 4 and 37.

This development does not include any parking for the residents or the business. The first photo shows two cars parked partly on the pavement on a private road (owned by the Railways) and on double yellow lines. Whilst these cars may not belong to the applicant's business they are very similar to the vehicles the business uses. This image shows that the current site is unable to function without abusing existing parking controls – yet they expect the future business to operate without them. A development that stepped back from the road could accommodate at least a couple of spaces.

I would suggest that an additional reason for refusal is lack of parking for future residents and the future expanded business. This development could not accommodate disabled residents without access to disabled parking which is not possible on street at this location as it is a bus route, so an off street disabled parking space is suggested. I note the transport assessment that an access directly to this site on a junction is not possible. But that does not stop the developer accessing the site from the church car park next door or buying spaces there. The Church park is used for a limited number of hours a week. A disabled resident could not walk to the proposed car club bay in Hill View not could that support business parking – which already abuses the current restrictions

It is LBB's Environmental Services policy that low car and car free developments are not entitled to apply for CPZ parking permits – as that would be contrary to the definition of the development.



The Planning statement states:

3.6. The plans confirm that secure cycle storage would be provided for each apartment and this could be secured by planning condition.

The transport statement provides an image (below) which is not secure – nor secure from others in the development. Residents who have cycles as their main mode of transport often spend considerable sums on a bike – now often (in hilly areas such as this part of station) with batter assistance. This is not adequate.

I would suggest an additional reason of refusal is that the application does not provide individual secure cycle parking. Individual secure cycle parking (cycle lockers are not expensive to provide and provide space for storage of cycle kit/spares as well and do not take up much more space.

