

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 8 March 2011

### **Present:**

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)  
Councillor Charles Joel (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Reg Adams, Douglas Auld, Eric Bosshard,  
Katy Boughey, Lydia Buttinger, Peter Dean, Simon Fawthrop,  
Peter Fookes, Will Harmer, John Ince, Russell Jackson,  
Mrs Anne Manning, Russell Mellor and Richard Scoates

### **84 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Paul Lynch.

### **85 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **86 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 8 FEBRUARY 2011**

Page 57, final paragraph and first two paragraphs on page 58

Councillor Russell Mellor was informed that the documents relating to the application in question had been sent to the Planning Inspectorate. Councillor Mellor was advised that he should write to the Inspectorate personally with regard to his enquiries.

**RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2011 be confirmed and signed as a true record.**

### **87 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING**

No questions had been received.

### **88 CORE STRATEGY - LOCAL AREAS, STRATEGIC THEMES AND ISSUES**

In January 2011, the Local Development Framework Advisory Panel (LDFAP) endorsed the approach taken on the development of a Core Strategy Issues Document. The LDFAP also requested that Development Control Committee consider the developing Bromley Borough area pen portraits and overall structure and approach of the document which would be issued for consultation purposes in preparation for the development of Bromley's Core

Strategy. The Core Strategy would form the principal policy within the suite of documents constituting the Local Development Framework (LDF).

The report contained draft outlines of the key elements proposed for the Core Strategy Issues Document; visions and objectives for the Borough; 13 of the 21 area pen portraits (a further 3 area pen portraits were e-mailed to Members and were also circulated separately before the meeting) and strategic issues and themes. The remainder of the pen portraits would be available for Member comments at the next meeting of the Development Control Committee on 19 April.

Mr McQuillan, Chief Planner, gave a brief outline of the report and reminded Members that the document was not yet complete. Member comments would be reported to a meeting of the LDFAP on 24 March (which has since been moved to a proposed new date of 4 May 2011). Meanwhile, Members could forward any comments or amendments direct to Mr McQuillan by 24 March). A final decision on the document would be taken by the Executive Committee at a meeting to be held on 25 May.

The area pen portraits were a direct result of three workshops held in 2009/2010 and although the depicted areas were not an exact mirror of existing Ward boundaries, they were detailed enough for Members to determine relevant issues within particular Wards.

Member views and suggested amendments for the three appendices are set out below.

#### Appendix 1 - Bromley in 2025

*Community facilities (page 18)* - Members were disappointed to note that reference to libraries had been omitted but were mindful of the current situation with regard to the intended closure of some Ward facilities. It was agreed that libraries would be referred to where appropriate.

*Built Heritage (page 19)* - The first sentence was amended to read: 'Our man-made heritage assets - areas of distinctive character, listed buildings, conservation areas and monuments - are protected and enhanced. It was agreed that a further objective be added to read:- 'Encourage a proactive approach to the improvement of heritage assets'.

*Climate Change and environmental issues (page 19)* - Councillor Fawthrop suggested that the objective 'Ensure carbon reduction is a priority of any new development', should be more specific. Councillor Fawthrop also alluded to the fact that no mention had been made about the use of methane or other deadly greenhouse gases. Mr McQuillan responded that the use of such gases would be covered by the first objective 'Design and construct any new buildings to help reduce impacts of a changing climate'.

*Transport (page 19)* - Councillor Fawthrop stated that while it was good to encourage the use of public transport, it should not be promoted at a time

when savings in public finances were to be made. It was suggested that it be clearly noted in the objectives that the Council welcomed and valued car ownership.

Mr McQuillan reported that the transport objectives had been approved by the Local Implementation Plan for Highways. It was agreed that the objective 'Promote the use of public transport, walking and cycling' be amended to read 'Encourage the use of public transport, walking and cycling including new modes of transport'.

The fourth sentence of the description should be amended to read:- 'Any new developments should, where appropriate, include electric vehicle charging points and more car clubs, increasing transport choices for local people.'

*Business and employment (page 18)* - Councillor Russell Mellor was concerned at the lack of manufacturing businesses being established in Bromley. Members agreed that a further objective be added to read: 'Encourage an adequate supply of commercial land in the Borough'.

*Open Space (page 17)* - Councillor Lydia Buttinger sought clarification on the meaning of 'open space'. Mr McQuillan responded that 'open space' referred to both open and natural land. It was agreed that the title be amended to read 'Open and Natural Space'. Councillor Buttinger was disappointed to note that the protection of trees had not been included as an objective. It was agreed that the first objective be amended to read:- 'Protect open spaces, natural environments and trees.'

*Town centres (page 18)* - Councillor Will Harmer was surprised to note that nightlife was not alluded to as it contributed hugely to the prosperity of town centres. It was agreed that a further objective be added to read:- 'Encourage a safe and prosperous evening economy.'

Councillor Mrs Manning was disappointed to note that Appendix 1 did not give sufficient emphasis to the high quality open space, 50% of which is Green Belt land, the 40 conservation areas and the number of listed and locally listed buildings within the Borough. Mr McQuillan agreed to redraft the description to include the above points.

*Housing (page 18)* - The Chairman suggested (and it was agreed), that the third objective be amended to read:- 'Ensure any new housing development complements and respects local character in terms of design, density and car parking.'

#### Appendix 2 - Area Pen Portraits

*Beckenham Copers Cope and Kangley Bridge (page 23)* - As Ward Member for Copers Cope, Councillor Russell Mellor commented that the report was comprehensive but he had doubts concerning the accuracy of the first paragraph on page 24.

With regard to the second paragraph, Councillor Mellor stated that the loss of the Dylon factory was very disappointing. He emphasised the need for industrial estates to be retained and underlined the importance of maintaining a balanced planning policy.

There was a demand for a large number of schools but there was only limited amount of open space.

The introduction of the Copers Cope parking zone had proved to be successful and Councillor Mellor commented on the need for further car parking areas and suggested the introduction of underground car parks.

The lower section of the area toward Clock House was dense and there was no room for development unless buildings were demolished.

Councillor Mellor queried whether statistical evidence backed up statements in the report.

*Bickley (page 27) - no comments.*

*Bromley Common (page 30) - As Ward Member, the Chairman made the following comments:-*

Paragraph 1 of the section entitled 'Character', should make reference to the new development at the former Blue Circle site.

The Chatterton Village area combines residential, retail and small industrial areas. However, there had been a decline in the number of industrial units, most of which had been converted into residential units. The Chairman felt that small industrial areas needed to be encouraged.

There was no mention of the new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in the Chatterton Road area. Reference to the CPZ in and around Chatterton Road would be inserted in the 'Connectivity' section of the report.

Although generally opposed to applications for developments on Green Belt land, the major development on Crown Lane would yield additional social infrastructure i.e. extra care housing and a much needed new surgery.

The words 'and Higher Education' should be deleted from the first line on page 31.

*Chislehurst (page 33) - Referring to Demography and Community on page 33, Ward Member Councillor Katy Boughey, questioned the accuracy of the statement that 'the northern part of the area suffers from higher levels of deprivation than the rest of the area'. Councillor Boughey suspected that Mottingham had been included as part of the pen portrait and suggested that Mottingham did not form part of the Chislehurst pen portrait area. Mr McQuillan confirmed that it was very difficult to separate the two areas as they were, in effect, overlapping.*

Councillor Boughey reported that there were no opportunities to reduce congestion around the War Memorial. As a result, it was agreed that the final question under the 'Key Issues and Main Opportunities' section be deleted.

Alluding to the problems of parking in the High Street and the surrounding areas, Councillor Boughey made reference to the bus stop outside Sainsbury's supermarket which caused traffic congestion at Willow Grove and the High Street. A possible solution was to move that particular bus stop.

Elderly residents in Mottingham were quite often isolated and living in accommodation too large for their needs. Councillor Boughey suspected that those residents may relinquish their accommodation if alternative housing was to be made available to them.

With reference to connectivity it was noted that residents of Bickley travelled to Chislehurst for trains to London Charing Cross, and residents of Chislehurst travel to Bickley for trains to London Victoria.

*Clock House, Elmers End and Eden Park (page 36)* - Ward Member for Clock House, Councillor Reg Adams, commented that the pen portrait was well written but a reference to libraries had been omitted from the description.

Councillor Adams stated that connectivity in the area was excellent with access to trams and mainline London railway terminals. For the purposes of clarity it was suggested (and agreed) that the first two sentences of the section entitled 'Connectivity' should be amended to read:- 'The 3 areas designated on the map had a good range of public transport links to neighbouring boroughs and Central London, although public transport to Bromley Town Centre is limited to four bus routes. Clock House, Elmers End and Grove Park have rail stations on the Hayes to Charing Cross line which link to the Docklands Light Railway at Lewisham.

In response to the questions within the key issues and main opportunities section, Councillor Adams reported the following:-

*Question 1* - The suburban residential character of the area could be maintained with the use of light industry employing people who live locally, as with the existing Rowden Works (which should be mentioned within the report). Currently, with the great availability of public transport many people commuted to London.

*Question 2* - A Controlled Parking Zone was in existence but parking pressures were immense, particularly around the hospital, the spa and library. Urging the Council to think innovatively, Councillor Adams agreed with Councillor Mellor's suggestion of underground parking.

*Question 5* - The site at Churchfields (formerly belonging to NPower) had lain vacant for more than 10 years. It would be great to see the site reoccupied or redeveloped.

*Question 6* - Several schools within the area were changing to academy status and the report should to be amended to reflect this.

As Ward Member for Kelsey and Eden Park, Councillor Peter Dean gave the following responses to the questions on key issues and main opportunities:-

*Question 1* - The area was urban in the extreme. Accommodation consisted of terraced and semi-detached housing. There were no flats. The majority of submitted planning applications were for extensions only, as very little space was available to do anything more.

*Question 3* - There were five parks in the Ward which was a significant number considering the size of the area. All parks contained football pitches which were underused. The Council should encourage the use of sports grounds.

*Question 4* - There were a few vacant shops at Elmers End but by and large all shops were all well occupied.

*Question 5* - The 'Wellcome' site had recently been vacated and could be reused for commercial use. However it was possible that it would be developed for other purposes.

*Question 6* - Changes by the three secondary schools to academy status were a welcome improvement.

The Chairman reported that the Studio Arts Centre was currently being refurbished and brought back into use.

*Cray Valley, St Paul's Cray and St Mary Cray (page 40)* - Ward Member for Cray Valley West, Councillor John Ince made the following observations:-

There were some inaccuracies within the report. While deprivation existed, it only occurred in small pockets, particularly in the St Paul's Cray, St Mary Cray and Cotmandene areas. The area benefited from large amounts of open space i.e. to the north east there was farmland and Hobblingwell Woods, the top end of which was a habitat for wildlife. This should be highlighted within the report.

There were plans to incorporate a resource centre in Cotmandene Crescent.

With reference to housing, Councillor Ince reported that St Paul's Cray had benefited hugely from the 'right to buy' policy. However, his weekly surgeries were full of housing association residents seeking help with unresolved maintenance problems. Many shops and public houses had closed down, to be replaced by high density housing.

There were small pockets of unemployment within the area.

With regard to 'Connectivity'(page 42), it was noted that trains from St Mary Cray do not run to St Pancras and reference to this should be deleted from the report.

It was agreed that the final paragraph on page 42 be amended to read:- 'How can the quality of the housing stock be improved? Is additional residential development desirable or needed?'

It was agreed that the final question relating to Cray Valley Wanderers FC (page 43) be deleted.

*Crofton and Farnborough (page 45)* - Ward Member, Councillor Charles Joel requested that the Ward name be amended to read 'Farnborough and Crofton'. He commented that the area was great for country walks and this should be reflected in the report.

There were inaccuracies in references to:-

- the statistics on residents' ages;
- health;
- statistics for schools; and
- shopping centres/parades.

All major GP surgeries and bus termini should be clearly marked on all plans.

Councillor Joel would send his views with suggested amendments to the Chief Planner.

*Crystal Palace, Penge and Anerley (page 48)* - Ward Member for Penge and Cator, Councillor Peter Fookes, asked what the economic impact would be if a major football club was to establish itself within the area.

The following comments were also made by Councillor Fookes:-

- The report should reflect the existence of the new London overground railway service;
- Health facilities were in need of improvement;
- Some prosperous areas did exist;
- There was no shortage of supermarkets; and
- It was good to see that Yeoman House was being redeveloped into an 83-bedroom hotel.

With reference to 'Social Infrastructure' (page 49) Councillor Adams suggested the amendment of the sixth line, second sentence to read:- 'Demand for primary school places has increased and the provision of school capacity in this area is complicated by the flow of pupils across Borough boundaries.'

The sentence beginning on the fifth line of the section entitled 'Connectivity' should be amended to read:- 'Crystal Palace, Penge West, Penge East and Anerley stations offer a range of routes to Victoria, London Bridge and East Croydon, as well as the new London Overground which links South East London with East London'.

The first sentence of the first paragraph in the section entitled 'Character' should be amended to read:- 'The far North West is dominated by Crystal Palace Park and the top of Sydenham Hill'.

*Hayes (page 52)* - Ward Member, Councillor Mrs Anne Manning requested that the Chief Planner send her a copy of the document via e-mail.

Councillor Manning pointed out that the reference with regard to there being six bus routes was inaccurate as it was possible to travel to numerous places, with the exception of Beckenham.

Referring to the third key issue, it was noted that Hayes does not have a town centre.

Councillor Manning commented that employment opportunities could arise from existing premises on Hayes Common being reoccupied.

In relation to transport, Councillor Mrs Manning hoped the railway line would be kept open and stated that there was not enough off-street parking provision within the area.

Councillor Fawthrop commented that as Coney Hall was politically linked to Hayes, it would make sense for Hayes and Coney Hall to be tagged together. Councillor Mrs Manning agreed with this observation as residents in Coney Hall travelled to Hayes to shop and use the railway station.

*Keston (page 55)* - As Ward Member for Keston, the Chairman made the following comments:-

- references to deprivation within the area were inaccurate and the first sentence of the section entitled 'Business and Employment' should be deleted; and
- the existence of Keston Garden Centre in Oakley Road should be included in the employment section.



With regard to key issues and main opportunities, the Chairman commented that:-

- the Keston Mark area was well served by buses but it would be helpful to have a route from Keston Village to the Princess Royal University Hospital;
- no opportunities existed to improve cycle routes in the area;
- the final key issue question should be amended to read:- 'Is pressure for development eroding the special qualities of the Keston Park and Farnborough Park Conservation Areas?'. In response to the question, the Chairman stated that pressure for development was eroding the special qualities of the Keston Park and Farnborough Park Conservation Areas. In addition, the whole area bounded by Croydon Road, Oakley Road and Hastings Road was becoming urbanised by new developments, such as the new development on the former allotment site between Oakley Road and Gravel Road. There were concerns regarding the former allotment site on Croydon Road as it had lain redundant for many years. It was situated on Green Belt land and should not to be used to supply housing but returned to its original use or an appropriate Green Belt use.

*Mottingham (page 59)* - Councillor Fookes reported that the Coldharbour Leisure Centre was situated within Greenwich, not Lewisham as stated in the section on social infrastructure. This should be amended.

*Shortlands, Park Langley and Pickhurst (page 62)* - Pickhurst should be removed from the title as it was situated within Hayes.

It was requested that more emphasis be placed on the importance of private gardens.

The connectivity section should contain reference to the 367 bus which travels through Beckenham to Croydon.

The first bullet point under the section entitled 'Key Issues and Main Opportunities' should be amended to read:- 'How can we preserve the remaining Edwardian and Victorian buildings to the character of the area?'.

The final question on page 64 should be deleted.

*West Wickham and Coney Hall (page 66)* - Councillor Mrs Manning observed that Coney Hall had a greater link with Hayes than with West Wickham.

With reference to the key issues and main opportunities, the following comments were made:-

- Changes permitted over the years had damaged the appearance of certain areas;

- The shopping centre was dying and was now an area of restaurants and cafes;
- Community facilities were good; and
- In respect of the potential of the former All Saints/John Rigby school site, it was important to maintain the character of the school.

Councillor Fawthrop alluded to the Coney Hall Estate which was originally intended as a starter home scheme. At times of economic pressure, owners had been unable to move up the housing ladder and had opted to remain where they were by extending and modifying their homes instead which made them no longer fit for use as starter homes.

It was suggested that the word 'deprived' be replaced with alternate wording throughout the document.

### Appendix 3 - Bromley's Strategic Issues

Councillor Mellor referred to the lack of surgeries and availability of GPs within Copers Cope Ward, which meant that residents in the north of the Ward had a fair distance to travel for appointments. Councillor Mellor requested that Members of Planning Committees look favourably upon planning applications relating to change of use to surgeries.

#### **RESOLVED that:-**

- 1) the structure and approach to preparing the Core Strategy Issues Document as set out in the report be agreed;**
- 2) with reference to the objectives, area pen portraits and strategic themes forming Appendices 1-3, that the comments and suggested amendments referred to above be considered by the Local Development Advisory Panel on 24 March 2011 (meeting subsequently moved to 4 May 2011 and may be subject to further change); and**
- 3) the remaining area pen portraits be considered at the next meeting of Development Control Committee on 19 April.**

#### **89 PLANNING BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2010/11**

Members considered an update on the latest budget monitoring position for the Planning Division for 2010/11 based on expenditure and activity levels up to 31 December 2010. It was noted that the latest projections indicated an underspend of £127,000.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

**90 PRE-PLANNING APPLICATION ADVICE - REVIEW OF CHARGES MADE FOR THE SERVICE**

Members reviewed proposed changes to the pre-application advice service and the suggested increase of non-profit making fees charged for major developments consisting of 10 or more dwellings or developments of over 1000 sq m and 1 ha. Charges for the service had remained static for the past three years.

Councillor Richard Scoates stated that the Planning Department should be self-sufficient. He suggested the use of time sheets to provide evidence of the amount of office time spent on giving advice.

The Chief Planner reported that time sheets had been used and that the proposed charges were a result of officer time spent giving advice together with the comparison with fees charged by other Boroughs. He reminded Members that the service was optional but only a limited number of applications had been considered where advice had not previously been sought.

Councillor Fawthrop suggested (and Members agreed) that the proposed charges set out in paragraph 3.15 should be set higher at £1750 (including VAT) for 10-25 dwellings of 1000-2000m<sup>2</sup> and £4,000 (including VAT) for major developments of more than 25 dwellings/2000m<sup>2</sup>.

Councillor Mrs Manning emphasised the need for consistency and suggested that the total fee charged (including VAT) should be clearly stated at all times to avoid any misunderstanding.

Councillor Mellor suggested that fees be increased proportionate to the overall cost of individual developments.

**RESOLVED that:**

**1) the proposed charges set out in paragraph 3.15 of the report should be increased to £1750 (including VAT) for 10-25 dwellings of 1000-2000m<sup>2</sup> and £4,000 (including VAT) for major developments of more than 25 dwellings/2000m<sup>2</sup>; and**

**2) the proposed increases at set out in 1) above be referred to the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation.**

**91 PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF CHARGES FOR PRE-PLANNING APPLICATION ADVICE ON NON-MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS**

Members were requested to endorse the introduction of a charging structure for pre-application meetings in relation to non-major developments (i.e. minor and household proposals). Prior to this, no fee had been levied for the provision of such advice.

The report outlined the suggested fees to be charged for specific types of developments and included a table of projected annual income.

The three categories for which a fee would be charged were:-

- Householder proposals and small scale minor applications;
- 1-4 residential units; and
- 5-9 residential units.

For smaller scale minor applications, it was suggested that fees should reflect the scale of the proposals.

A review would be undertaken in six months to establish how effective the charging system had proved to be, and upon completion a further report would be submitted for consideration by Members.

Councillor Mrs Manning was concerned that some householders would not pay for the advice or were unaware of the need for advice, which could result in an inordinate amount of retrospective applications coming before Planning Committees. The Chief Planner stated that should an application prove to be defective where no pre-application advice was sought, the Planning Department would not seek to remedy that application. Brief pre-application advice would still be free to householders for non-complex issues but a charge would be levied for in-depth pre-application advice. A section entitled 'Terms of Trade' would be placed on the Planning website for information purposes.

Councillor Fawthrop suggested (and Members agreed), that the proposed fee for 5-9 residential units/up to 1000m<sup>2</sup> be increased to £875. Councillor Mrs Manning emphasised the need for consistency and suggested that the total fee charged (including VAT) should be clearly stated at all times to avoid any misunderstanding.

**RESOLVED that:**

- 1) the principle of charging for pre-application advice for non-major development proposals be agreed;**
- 2) the proposed fees (including VAT which must be clearly and consistently shown at all times), be agreed. (See amended table of costs attached as Appendix 1); and**
- 3) a recommendation on the above proposals be made to the Portfolio Holder.**

**92            PARKING POLICY CHANGES**

Changes to Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport, had resulted in the elimination of maximum residential parking standards. Local authorities would become responsible for setting their own residential parking standards to reflect circumstances in different parts of the Borough. A more flexible approach would need to be adopted for the provision of off-street parking for new residential developments and all planning applications would need to be considered on individual merit.

Councillor Fawthrop commented that he would like to see the policy defined as trying to minimise on-street parking with consideration given to the surrounding area. For this purpose there should be a general principle policy.

**RESOLVED that:-**

- 1)     work be continued on gathering evidence to develop an appropriate set of residential parking standards to reflect circumstances in different parts of the Borough and that such standards are incorporated into the Local Development Framework in due course;**
- 2)     a more flexible approach be adopted to the provision of off-street parking spaces in new residential developments and that planning applications are considered on their individual merits in the light of the particular circumstances of the locality; and**
- 3)     parking provision for new developments should be consistent with the character of the area to minimise on-street parking and reduce impact where possible.**

**93            LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 AS AMENDED BY THE  
LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCESS TO INFORMATION)  
(VARIATION) ORDER 2006, AND THE FREEDOM OF  
INFORMATION ACT 2000**

**RESOLVED that the Press and public be excluded during consideration of the items of business referred to in the following Minutes as it is likely in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings that if members of the Press and public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information.**

**The following summaries  
refer to matters involving  
exempt information**

**94 FORMER BLUE CIRCLE SITE: JOINT USE EDUCATION  
PAYMENT 106 CONTRIBUTION**

Members considered a proposal put forward by the developer of the former Blue Circle Site in Bromley in relation to a joint use education payment 106 contribution.

**RESOLVED that the report be deferred to negotiate an increase in the level of payment.**

**95 LEGAL CHALLENGE TO DECISION OF SECRETARY OF  
STATE IN RESPECT OF APPLICATIONS FOR CRYSTAL  
PALACE PARK**

Members considered an information report outlining the details of a legal challenge issued in the High Court against the decision made by the Secretary of State in respect of applications for Crystal Palace Park.

**RESOLVED that the report be noted.**

The Meeting ended at 10.50 pm

Chairman

# Minute Annex

## AMENDED SCHEDULE OF COSTS

<b>Type of Pre-application Fee</b>	<b>Proposed price (incl. VAT) £</b>
Householder proposals and small scale minor applications	42.00
1-4 Residential units/up to 499 square metres floorspace	480.00
5-9 residential units/between 500 and 1000 square metres floorspace	900.00

This page is left intentionally blank