

## Brookworth Homes development: bullet points

- The application to build houses on the garden land at the rear of 22 St James Way was rejected in 1967, again in 1973 both by Planning and the Planning Inspector and yet again in 1985 as a form of undesirable backland development detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties. One out of character with the existing development in the vicinity and one which would dominate and overlook neighbouring properties as part of the site is on rising land. What is different today that would justify planning approval this time around? Especially as, since then, Bexley has produced a Policy document (CS17) that promises to resist harmful backland development – which this clearly is.
- The application site is not previously developed land that might be regarded as “brownfield” and so appropriate for a housing development. It is *garden*-land, albeit it has been neglected and has some hard-standing. Building on garden land was not the government's intention when it drew up its National Planning Policy Framework. Moreover, such development is contrary to Bexley's Policy CS17, which promises that Bexley will resist harmful backland development.
- The applicant argues that its development of five new houses would make a key contribution to Bexley's housing supply. It would not – and at what cost to local residents! Moreover, with the loss a few years ago of our school and playing fields to make way for a large housing estate, and the recent decision to allow a development six houses at 139 North Cray Road in our precious Green Belt land, North Cray has already made a significant contribution to Bexley's housing supply. Enough is surely enough!
- The formation of a new cul-de-sac of several houses on garden land at the rear of houses in St James Way and The Grove would deprive the residents of adjoining properties of amenities and privacy which they, very reasonably, expect to enjoy. To have a road running at the foot of their garden, or houses close to their rear boundary, is not what people want and will deprive them of the peace and quiet enjoyment of their garden.
- The new access road and the passage of vehicles would be a considerable nuisance to adjacent residents- especially to those who would have this road running close to the bottom of their garden. And if it were to be a road with street lighting, this would create an additional nuisance in the form of light pollution. Not only this - a new vehicular access road on the presently closed garden land between the houses in St James Way and The Grove would reduce the present level of security that people have. Who would want to have a new cul-de-sac and road created at the bottom of their garden and such a disturbing activity introduced to their lives?

- The development site is located within an especially nice area in which to live, and it adjoins a Conservation Area (High Beeches). What is being planned would be an intrusion of this area and have a damaging effect its character. This was recognised by Planning and the Planning Inspector on the previous occasions when plans to build houses on the garden land at the rear of No. 22 St James Way were under consideration. What is different today?
- In the case of the previous attempts in 1973 and 1984 to build houses on the garden land behind 22 St James Way especial concern was expressed by Planning over the damaging effect building foundations would have on the far-spreading roots of the centuries-old Cedar tree in the garden of No. 22 – a tree which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). This tree is a much loved feature of this area and one which is also important in the history of North Cray. It was planted by the famous landscape gardener Lancelot 'Capability' Brown when he was landscaping the parkland of North Cray Place in c1782 (now Footscray Meadows). What is different today as regards the damaging effect the building of houses and their foundations etc would have on this tree? We do not find the applicant's lengthy "Arboricultural Survey" report convincing as there is no mention of this historic tree's roots – a factor which clearly caused concern to to Planning and Planning Inspectors on previous occasions. Of serious concern, too, is the proposal (clearly indicated on the plans for the site) to brutally prune back this tree for the sake of the proposed new houses.