



THE LONDON BOROUGH
www.bromley.gov.uk

BROMLEY CIVIC CENTRE, STOCKWELL CLOSE, BROMLEY BR1 3UH

TELEPHONE:

020 8464 3333

CONTACT: Philippa Gibbs

Philippa.Gibbs @bromley.gov.uk

DIRECT LINE:

020 8461 7638

FAX:

020 8290 0608

DATE: 4 January 2022

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Meeting to be held on Tuesday 11 January 2022

Please see the attached questions to the Committee.

- 3 **QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING** (Pages 1 - 8)

Copies of the documents referred to above can be obtained from
<http://cds.bromley.gov.uk/>

This page is left intentionally blank

Agenda Item 3

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 11 JANUARY 2022

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED FOR ORAL REPLY

1. From Mr Stuart Mayer (to be asked by Ms Tara Swift on Mr Mayers's behalf)

The London Plan states that a developments density should be proportionate the sites connectivity to jobs and service. The Walnuts site has a PTAL rating of 4 while Lewisham and Croydon have PTALs 6b. Would the committee agree that any development of a similar density to these towns would be inappropriate here?

2. From Ms Lara Suths

Why is the Areli development contrary to the Bromley local plan (section 4 transport and accessibility Policy 30 Residential Parking Standards) which states that provision of parking should be 0.7 - 1.5 for tower blocks providing 1-2 bedroom to 3 bedroom properties respectively? The current plan proposes an allocation of 0.3 parking spaces per household.

Context: Please see below.

FROM THE BROMLEY LOCAL PLAN SECTION 4

4.1.5 Bromley has one of the highest car ownership levels in London (1.2 per household, Census 2011) and an average public transport accessibility level (PTAL) score of 2.7 (Transport for London, 2010)

Parking standards in Table 1 reflect these local circumstances.

2*-6a	1-2 bed	3 bed	4 bed
	0.7 (min) - 1 (max)	1 (min) - 1.5 (max)	1.5 (min) - 2 (max)

Minimum levels of parking for new residential developments are required in order to ensure new developments do not generate additional intrusive or obstructive on-street parking as a result of inadequate on-site provision.

3. From Mr John Pead

Would the 19 story buildings in the proposed Walnuts development impinge on the 2 "views of local importance" listed in the local plan at Crofton Road and at Chelsfield Green?

4. From Ms Paula Peters

1. The current lift access in the walnuts Car park is not accessible for disabled people using mobility equipment like power wheelchairs and mobility scooters which require a turning circle to enter & reverse safely. Are the plans going to provide bigger accessible lifts for the walnuts car park?
2. To comply with Fire Safety Regs and the Equalities Act of 2010 will the developers install fire exit signs and buttons in British Sign Language as there are disabled people where BSL is their first language for the Saxon day centre and residential buildings?

5. From Mr Derek Archer

Background: At present residents of the Walnuts Estate, and further afield, enjoy Digital TV and Radio services from the Crystal Palace transmitter. These signals radiate in straight lines and go very close to the current tower block at Orpington College. Any new high rise developments in this vicinity would adversely affect, if not totally block, reception to Walnuts Estate residents.

Would the Development Control Committee please give an assurance that any developments near to the Walnuts Centre would not affect TV and Radio reception to Walnuts Estates residents?

P.S: Please note that in similar situations developers have suggested they might support the roll out of fibre TV services. This would not be a suitable alternative as the Walnuts Estate is already fully fibred by both BT and Virgin. Their services are not supplied free of charge, as the existing transmissions are from Crystal Palace, so would cause residents additional costs in perpetuity.

6. Mr Andrew Stotesbury

Will this committee provide full disclosure and details of any: contracts, contact, arrangements, and accommodations between anyone within Bromley Council and Areli including: anyone within their payment or influence? To include: meetings and records, details of any 'ad-hoc' contacts, discussions, and documentation. If not then provide comprehensive details why?

7. From Ms Sheila Brown

Context: I understand that the Developers are intending to carry out their proposals in phases. Phase one involves demolition of the Walnuts Leisure Centre, to construct one of the 19 storey towers. I object most strongly to this demolition of a perfectly usable, serviceable building, leaving residents without this highly valued and well used amenity. Given Bromley's target of reducing emissions, it has been shown that emissions from demolition of buildings are a huge contributory factor, and in light of discussions at the recent COP26 it flies in the face of all common sense to embark on a huge programme of demolition in a town centre.

1. How does Bromley Council, plan to protect nearby residents and business employees from pollution and emissions resulting from the demolition process? Surely any procedure of this kind would have to have a Health and Safety procedure established? I urge Bromley Council to think long and hard about this and to seek professional advice before making any decision to proceed.

8. From Ms Alsia Igoe

Reference: Item 6: Planning Application (21/03231/FULL 1) – 70 High Street, Bromley BR1 1EG and Item 7: Planning Application (21/03622/FULL1) Burnt Ash Heights, Pike Close, Bromley BR1 5BN

1. Documents for neither of these applications, for extremely large developments, were included with the agenda when it was published. The papers were eventually added on 5 January, and Democratic Services confirmed the extension of the 48 hour public agenda question deadline until 7 January. Were residents living at Pike Close Estate notified of the deadline extension for questions for Item 7?

Reference: Item 7: Planning Application (21/03622/FULL1) Burnt Ash Heights, Pike Close, Bromley BR1 5BN

2. Item 7 indicates 69 of the 92 social rent units are uninhabited. Whilst this application is recommended for refusal, would the committee propose to ask the developer to submit an amended application, particularly in light of the extreme need for social housing in Bromley highlighted by the Renewal Committee papers 30 March 2021 “there are currently just over 1800 households in temporary accommodation”?

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS HAVE BEEN SUBMITTED FOR WRITTEN REPLY

1. From Mr Paul Summers

Is and if so how is Bromley Council paying due regard to safe accessible cycling and walking routes, good quality public transport sited close to key services when it comes to housing development planning policy?

2. From Mr Steve Wehrle

Are the Committee aware of the amount of opposition to the current plans for the Walnuts, with various petitions and a Facebook group with nearly 900 locals, who do not want what is on offer from Areli?

3. From Ms Lucy Fairbairn

Why are you determined to make Orpington another Croydon? What is the benefit of High rises to the local population?

4. From Mr Peter Noorlander

1. Manufacturing and construction contribute 12% of UK greenhouse gas emissions, with cement, iron, steel, and energy intensive machinery required to construct with those materials representing a significant proportion. Will the committee consider adopting the retainment of all existing building frames and foundations, unless faults can't be remedied?
2. The Royal Institute of British Architects has advocated halting demolition in order to lower greenhouse gas emissions. It reports that 50,000 buildings are demolished in the UK every year, producing 126 million tonnes of waste - two-thirds of the UK's total. Will the committee consider a policy of repurposing existing structures over demolition?

5. From Ms Carol Pitman

How is Committee monitoring the number of unoccupied properties (including new-builds), and using this (current and reliable data) to inform its Orpington decisions - ensuring permission for residential building is not just a tick-box process for meeting housing targets, but demonstrably meets housing demand by area and by type?

6. From Ms Kelly Lee

As a resident of Uplands Road I am extremely concerned about Areli's proposals. Such overbearing structures would have a devastating impact on me and my neighbours through overshadowing and loss of privacy. Will the committee ensure that planning policy is correctly adhered to regarding loss of amenity to all immediate neighbours?

7. From Ms Gill Georgeson

Can the committee confirm that they will ensure that planning guidelines will be followed and that due consideration is given to loss of amenity to those homes in the immediate vicinity e.g. loss of light/overshadowing and privacy?

8. Ms Jean Seager

How can the council even consider building two 19 storey skyscrapers close to each other in the middle of the Walnuts shopping centre in Orpington when they will clearly be out of character with the existing area, as stated in the Local Plan? The visual impact in terms of height and density of these and the other 16 high rise blocks will be enormous and represents an overdevelopment of such a small area.

9. From Jamie Devine

1. To avoid additional congestion and pollution, improve residents' health and encourage active travel, new residential developments should remove all barriers to habitation without private transport. Will the committee consider a requirement for all new residential developments to be accessible to a suitably sized supermarket within a 10 minute walk?
2. High energy consumption and wastage are inherent in the design and construction of a building. The Local Plan cites the London Plan's ambition to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20%. Will the committee consider a much more ambitious and necessary requirement for all new developments to be passive?

10. From Mr David Morrison

1. How many meetings between Councillors and/or Council Officers have taken place with Areli/Tikehau (Walnuts owner) in connection with the proposed development of the Walnuts Centre?

Background: In the Local Government Association “Probity in Planning” advice on pre-planning application discussion it states “a written note of such meeting should be placed on file as a public record. If there is a legitimate reason for confidentiality regarding a proposal, a note of the non-confidential issues raised or advice given should be placed on file to reassure those not party to the discussion”

Please can you direct me to those notes? Would Montagu Evans who are advising the Council be subject to the same standards?

11. From Mr David Swift

Areli have told me that the new development will replicate existing facilities but haven't provided layout details. Can you confirm that the new public leisure facilities will have the same floor space as current leisure centre and if not could you advise the relative sizes?

12. Ms Kerry Sanders

Given the substantial number of apartments proposed in each block, I would like to know how highway safety will be maintained, particularly in light of the generation of additional traffic in the immediate area and taking into consideration the additional parking/loading, turning of vehicles, plus the noise and disturbance resulting from this?

13. From Mr David Marshall

1. Does the Council have a dedicated officer monitoring the development at Calverley Close and if so can details be provided?
2. Does the Council have a view on what constitutes good and poor consultation with regards to the development of a tenanted site, and what powers does it have to enforce best practice?

14. From Ms Sarah Fisher

I would like to ask a question at DCC on 11th Jan. Can the committee promise that residents of Homefield Rise will not be blighted by loss of light or privacy by the proposed development of the Walnuts. Will they also ensure that local roads are able to cope with the increased traffic that up to 1,000 new residents will create.

15. From Ms Chloe-Jane Ross

1. Is the DCC concerned about the height of the proposed development at Calverley Close which overlooks Beckenham Place Park which is used by many Beckenham residents, and does the Council have any powers to limit the height?
2. Some of the residents of Calverley Close have raised concerns about the development and the consultation processes of Riverside - what statutory and/or non statutory role does Bromley Council have in protecting residents?

This page is left intentionally blank