

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM COUNCILLOR FAWTHROP

Item 4.5 – 63 Kingsway, Petts Wood

Mr Chairman

First of all Mr Chairman can I compliment the report writer for extracting much of the Petts Wood ASRC description into the report.

What the report writer failed to do and every report writer seems to do this is ignore the ASRC guidelines contained within the Bromley Plan. Policy 44 refers in paragraph 5.1.10. which states that the Council will seek to protect the environmental character of these areas by requiring proposals to have regard to the guidelines.

I'm not going to go through the all the guidelines, but there are 12 in total.

No. 2 states that Residential density shall accord with that existing in the Area. There is no assessment against this criteria, but to suggest that a 66% increase in floor area accords with the existing density does not stack up mathematically.

No. 7 states new development will be required to take account of existing front and rear building lines. This development by extending by 6m doesn't accord with existing rear building lines and comparing it with what was a detached garage in the adjacent property is the wrong measure it has to be compared with the building lines of the existing buildings, which to coin a phrase makes this one stick out a mile. Not forgetting the obscure crown roof, which has been rejected by inspectors on numerous occasions.

All of these items taken together puts this in conflict with the no.1. guideline that developments likely to erode the quality and character of the ASRC will be resisted.

Let me just deal with Permitted Development Rights, under current rules a single storey rear extension could not extend by more than 4m at ground floor level and 3m at a two store level.

So when you compare this with what could be done without planning permission it is 50% more that would be allowed under PD rights.

Mr Chairman this application is a clear over development of the site. I would therefore urge you to refuse this under policy 44 with reference to guidelines 1, 2 and 7. This is also contrary to policy 6(a) given the scale of the proposals.

Item 4.16 - 150 Kingsway

This is a unique corner plot that sits on the corner of Kingsway and Towncourt Crescent.

This application differs from the previous application in that it is set back a further 0.5m from the boundary with Towncourt Crescent.

For the last application, the applicant had advised that if it was deferred, he would undertake to submit this reduction. Whilst he appealed the first decision the applicant would withdraw that appeal if this application were approved. The applicant has been good to his word, despite protestation from elsewhere that he would not keep to his word.

If there are concerns about this application, they can all be dealt with by way of conditions.

If this application is granted, there could be conditions

- 1) To remove all Permitted Development Rights, these would include home owner PD, HMO PD and garden PD to ensure the unique corner plot doesn't become a concrete jungle as a large area will be covered by development.
- 2) It can include a no severance clause, to prevent the home becoming two separate homes, as the plot size, doesn't lend itself to a high density pair of semi-detached houses.

I would recommend that you approve this application.