

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 30 May 2013

Present:

Councillor Charles Joel (Chairman)
Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Reg Adams, Kathy Bance MBE, Simon Fawthrop,
Julian Grainger, Russell Jackson, Kate Lymer and
Richard Scoates

Also Present:

Councillors Eric Bosshard, Robert Evans, William Huntington-
Thresher, John Ince, Russell Mellor and Ian F. Payne

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

All Members were present.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Following a request from Cllr Bosshard, an Urgency Committee considered his request to be allowed to address the meeting with regard to Item 4.13 where he had a pecuniary interest as a neighbouring resident. That Urgency Committee granted Cllr Bosshard an unconditional dispensation so that he could continue to represent the interests of people living in the area.

No other declarations of interest were reported.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 4 APRIL 2013

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 April 2013 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 1

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

4.1 CRAY VALLEY WEST

(13/01055/FULL2) - Belle Grove, 100 Mickleham Road, Orpington

Description of application - Change of use from care home for the elderly (Class C2) to short term accommodation for the homeless (sui generis) with refuse store and car and cycle parking.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Councillor Robert Evans, the Portfolio Holder for Care Services, in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor John Ince, were also received at the meeting. It was reported that if permission were granted that the Housing Division had agreed that homeless people and families from the Cray Valley Wards would be given preference to the proposed accommodation wherever possible.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner with three further conditions to read:-

“3. No more than 93 occupants shall be accommodated at Belle Grove 100 Mickleham Road at any one time without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to comply with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

4. Details of the proposed management and occupancy arrangements for the development, including any contractual requirements, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the premises shall subsequently be operated in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In order to comply with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

5. The landscaping details, which shall include details of screen planting along the boundary with Goose Green Close shall be submitted to and subsequently approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and shall be implemented in the first planting season following the occupation of the buildings or the substantial completion of the development whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species to those originally planted.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy BE1 and C1 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development and in the interest of the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.”

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

4.2 PENGE AND CATOR

(12/02318/FULL3) - First Floor Units 8 and 9 Abbey Trading Estate, Bell Green Lane, Sydenham East

Description of application - Change of use of part of ground and whole of first floor from business (class B1) to specialised martial arts teaching and gym (class D1) together with elevational alterations.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

4.3 SHORTLANDS CONSERVATION AREA

(12/02890/FULL6) - 26 Hayes Way, Beckenham

Description of application – Raised garden terrace at rear with walls and steps. RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

4.4 COPERS COPE CONSERVATION AREA

(13/00234/FULL1) - 15A Wickham Road, Beckenham

Description of application - Conversion of commercial building to provide one 5 bedroom dwelling.

Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor Russell Mellor, in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

The contents of a letter from the agent dated 30 May 2013 was reported. Councillor Simon Fawthrop stated that the value of a property was determined by how much a purchaser was prepared to pay.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED**, for the following reason:-

1. In the absence of evidence to demonstrate full and proper marketing of the site the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of commercial premises, thereby contrary to EMP5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4.5 CLOCK HOUSE

(13/00339/FULL1) - Phantasy, 17 Allen Road, Beckenham

Description of application - Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom dwelling with 3 car parking spaces.

It was noted that on page 37 of the Chief Planner's report the first sentence under the heading, 'Proposal' should be amended to read, "Planning permission is sought to demolish the existing bungalow and to erect two 2 bedroom and one 1 bedroom houses". Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

4.6 BROMLEY TOWN

(13/00389/FULL2) - Lancaster House, 7 Elmfield Road, Bromley

Description of application – Change of use of ground floor from office (use class B1) to a private members club (sui generis). Formation of new entrance to Elmfield Road and the installation of new ventilation and extract system.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that further objections to the application had been received. It was also reported that on page 50 of the Chief Planner's report, that paragraph 3 should be amended to read, "Having had regard to the above it was considered that the development in the manner proposed would represent the loss of needed office space in the Bromley Town Centre Area, thus contrary to the objectives of policies EMP3, EMP5 of the Unitary Development Plan and policy IA2 of the Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan. It was also reported that further objections to the application had been received.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the following reason:-

1. The site is located in a Business Improvement Area as designated in the Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan and the change of use of the ground floor to a private members club (sui generis), would by reason of the undesirable loss of office space (Class B1), be detrimental to the Council's aim to safeguard a supply of land in the Borough to provide for growth and development of business and industry, contrary to Policies IA2 and BTC5 of the Bromley Town Centre Area Action Plan and EMP3 and EMP5 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**4.7
CRAY VALLEY EAST**

(13/00455/FULL2) - 44 Lynton Avenue, Orpington

Description of application - Use of detached building as office (Class B1).

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with the deletion of Condition 1.

**4.8
SHORTLANDS**

(13/00596/FULL6) - 29 Bushey Way, Beckenham

Description of application - Single storey rear extension and roof alterations incorporating increase of roof height, half hip and rear dormer extensions.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the following reason:-

1. The proposed extension would, by reason of the depth of its rearward projection, have a detrimental effect on the Area of Special Residential Character and on the daylighting of the adjoining house and the prospect which the occupants of that dwelling might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy, contrary to Policies BE1 and H10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**4.9
FARNBOROUGH AND
CROFTON CONSERVATION
AREA**

**(13/00691/FULL1) - Land Opposite 1 to 4 Tye Lane,
Orpington**

Description of application - Change of use of land from equestrian centre to residential and erection of 2 pairs of two storey two bedroom houses with associated car parking.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that the Fire Access and Building Inspector was satisfied there was adequate fire appliance access.

Cllr Simon Fawthrop said that in his opinion the site was not developable in principle, as it would affect the residential amenity.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the following reason:-

1. The proposal would, by reason of its design and excessive bulk and scale, result in an overdevelopment of the site, detrimental to the visual amenities, spatial standards and character of the area, contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**4.10
CRAY VALLEY EAST**

**(13/00703/FULL6) - 17 Northfield Avenue,
Orpington**

Description of application – Single storey rear extension.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1. The rear garden at this property is restricted in size and the proposed extension would, by reason of its excessive projection and close proximity to the boundary, result in an overdevelopment of the site and be seriously detrimental to the prospect of the adjoining property, contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**4.11
SHORTLANDS**

(13/00771/FULL6) - 90 Malmains Way, Beckenham

Description of application – First floor side and rear extension.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was noted that on page 75

of the Chief Planner's report that the first bullet point within paragraph 5 should be amended to read,

- "reduction in the width of the first floor side element as it relates to the latter third of the original dwelling (1.05m x 3.88m)."

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reason set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**4.12
BICKLEY**

**(13/00819/FULL6) - 91 Southborough Road,
Bickley**

Description of application – Two storey side and single storey rear extensions.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with a further condition:-

"6. A side space of no less than 0.85m shall be provided between the first floor flank wall of the extension hereby permitted and the flank boundary of the property.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the visual amenities of the area.

**4.13
CHISLEHURST**

**(13/00962/FULL2) - 51 Marlings Park Avenue,
Chislehurst**

Description of application – Change of use of premises from dwelling house with care provided (class C3) to care supported residential accommodation (class C2).

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillors Eric Bosshard and Ian F Payne, in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

Councillor Simon Fawthrop said that if this application were to be permitted it would be an over intensification, out of keeping in a family residential area and not conveniently located to local services, shops and amenities.

The differences between Class C3 (dwellinghouses) and Class C2 (residential institutions) and [the range of uses permissible within Class C2](#) were explained.

It was noted that Highways Division had no formal objection to the application.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. The change of use from dwelling house with care provided (Class C3) to care supported residential accommodation (Class C2) would result in over-intensive use of the site, inconveniently located from public services which would be out of keeping with the residential character of the area resulting in increased noise and disturbance thereby detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties, contrary to Policies BE1, H4 and C6 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**4.14
DARWIN
CONSERVATION AREA**

(13/01068/MATAMD) - Petleys Farm House, Luxted Road, Downe

Description of application – Change of use of part of existing outbuilding from car parking to purpose ancillary to the main residential use including elevational alterations (MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT TO APPEAL PERMISSION 09/00145/FULL2).

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. Councillor Simon Fawthrop was concerned that Members had no influence on the Planning Inspectorate's decision as to how appeals were dealt with and in his opinion this case, if subject to an appeal, would be suitable for the fast track procedure.

Members having considered the report and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1. The proposed development would result in the undesirable loss of covered parking within the curtilage of the dwelling and would be likely to lead to open parking, harmful to the openness and character of the Green Belt, contrary to Policy G1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**4.15
DARWIN
CONSERVATION AREA**

(13/01069/FULL2) - Petleys Farm House, Luxted Road, Downe

Description of application – Change of use of 2 agricultural buildings to provide 4 stables, feed room, tack room and associated storage and change of use of land for the private keeping of horses. Change of

use of part of agricultural building for car parking for existing residential use at Petleys Farm and re cladding of buildings.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. Councillor Simon Fawthrop was concerned that Members had no influence on the Planning Inspectorate's decision as to how appeals were dealt with and in his opinion this case, if subject to an appeal, would be suitable for the fast track procedure.

Members having considered the report, and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED**, for the following reason:-

1. The proposed conversion of two agricultural buildings to stables and change of use of land to the keeping of horses would result in an over-intensive equestrian use of this agricultural site thereby detrimental to the character of the Green Belt and Conservation Area, contrary to Policies G1, BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4.16 CRAY VALLEY EAST

(13/01078/FULL6) - 106 Perry Hall Road, Orpington

Description of application – Two storey side and rear extension with three front dormers.

Comments from Ward Member, Councillor David McBride, and a letter from the neighbour in objection to the application were reported. Reference was also made to the previous appeal decision and the Inspector's comments on the planning issues.

Members having considered the report, objections, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1. The proposed development would result in an overdevelopment of the site with insufficient car parking, inadequate side space and amenity space to be provided thereby detrimental to the of amenities of neighbouring properties, contrary to Policies H9 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Councillor Simon Fawthrop wished his vote for refusal to be recorded.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

**4.17
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(13/00432/FULL6) - The Cottage, Summer Hill
Lodge, Summer Hill, Chislehurst**

Description of application – First floor side extension.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**4.18
CHELSFIELD AND PRATTS
BOTTOM**

**(13/00724/FULL6) - 7 Oxenden Wood Road,
Orpington**

Description of application – Part one/two storey side and rear and single storey front extensions, roof alterations to incorporate rear dormers and elevational alterations.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. Members wished to record that their local knowledge of the character of the area was relevant to this planning application.

It was reported that there were two different side space measurements referred to in the Chief Planner's report based on earlier drawings and that the updated measurement was 1.16 metres. Ward Member, Councillor Julian Grainger, stated that he was acquainted with the objector, being a resident of the area, but that he had had no communication with him since a Jubilee Party celebration in 2012.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1. The proposed development would, by reason of the inadequate side space to be provided in an area where higher spatial standards are considered to exist, result in a retrograde lowering of spatial standards detrimental to the established character of the area, contrary to Policies BE1 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4.19
PENGE AND CATOR

(13/01134/FULL1) - Units 6-7 Lower Sydenham Industrial Estate, Kangley Bridge Road, Lower Sydenham

Description of application – Construction of canopy to create covered area for the loading, unloading and sorting of parcels from delivery vehicles in relation to Units 6, 7, 8 & 9.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner with a further condition to read:-

“6. The canopy hereby permitted must be open sided on both flank elevations.

REASON: In the interests of the visual amenities of the area, in line with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

4.20
BICKLEY

(13/01204/FULL1) - Wilderwood, Widmore Green, Bromley

Description of application – 4 two bedroom two storey terrace dwellings and 1 two bedroom chalet bungalow with 8 car parking spaces and associated outbuildings and landscaping.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that further objections to the application had been received.

Ward Member Councillor Kate Lymer made representations as set out in Appendix A to these Minutes.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1. The proposal constitutes a cramped overdevelopment of the site by reason of the type and nature of units proposed and if permitted would establish an undesirable pattern for similar piecemeal infilling in the area, out of character with the pattern of surrounding development and resulting in an over-intensive use of the site and a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present development, harmful to the visual amenities and character of the area and therefore contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan

and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan.

SECTION 4

(Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

4.21 PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL CONSERVATION AREA

(13/00815/FULL1) - Public Conveniences, Station Square, Petts Wood

Description of application – Demolition of former public convenience building, change of use of land to retail (class A1), and erection of a two storey retail building.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reason set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

4.22 ORPINGTON

(13/01227/FULL1) - 15 Paddocks Close, Orpington

Description of application – Erection of detached two storey 3 bedroom house to rear of 15 Paddocks Close with vehicular access from Alma Barn Mews and pedestrian access to Chelsfield Lane.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor William Huntington-Thresher, in objection to the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that the application had been amended by documents received on 15 May 2013. Members were of the opinion that the site line issue should not be underestimated in this instance.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reasons set out in the report of the Chief Planner with a further reason to read:-

3. The proposal would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site and unacceptable form of backland development contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 3.5 of the London Plan.

The meeting ended at 10.38 pm

Chairman

Minute Annex

APPENDIX A

ITEM 4.20 - (13/01204/FULL 1) - WILDERWOOD, WIDMORE GREEN, BROMLEY REPRESENTATIONS SUBMITTED BY WARD MEMBER COUNCILLOR KATE LYMER

I and my ward colleagues strongly oppose this Application, as do neighbouring residents and the Sundridge Residents Association.

Widmore Green is an important gateway site to Bromley Town Centre, Sundridge Avenue Conservation Area and Sundridge, and local residents are passionate about preserving the character of Widmore Green which is one of the few public open spaces in the area. In the early 20th century when Widmore was a village it was the village green when horse and cart was the only means of transport. The horse trough is still in situ. About ten years ago the Council refurbished the green and were sympathetic to its historical significance and put in finger signposts reminiscent of the type of sign which would have been there in the early 20th century. They built flower beds to stop cars parking on the grass and wearing it away. The site of Wilderwood provides an important backdrop to this historical setting. Any development at the site should be ancillary to the setting of the green rather than dominant. This proposal does not achieve this.

Wilderwood was originally the site of one bungalow set back in the centre of the site. 2 thirds of the site was garden, with a beautiful sweep of front lawn which formed the backdrop for Widmore Green. It is unacceptable to replace a bungalow with a chalet bungalow plus 4 houses, a collections of sheds as well as 8 unsightly highly visible car parking spaces .

It is not the right location for a terrace of small houses. Paragraph 4 on page 126 states that "When considering the recently dismissed appeal, the Inspector stated that the proposed terrace dwellings would be reflective of properties on Plaistow Lane." But it is not. There are no terrace dwellings in Plaistow Lane in Bickley. Properties are all detached in large plots, including an Ernest Newton house. Therefore this proposal is totally against the spacial standard that exists in Plaistow Lane. There are no terraces of houses in the vicinity of Plaistow Lane and this would create an unacceptable precedent.

Additionally these houses would also have high roofs which provides the capacity for further development within the roof space. This would facilitate even more intensive over development of the site.

The proposed car parking facilities for 8 vehicles would be in an elevated location as the site slopes uphill. This which would be a highly obtrusive focal point for the development and highly visible from Widmore Green as well as on the elevated approach along Widmore Road towards Bromley. Consequently this remains an extremely inappropriate backdrop to Widmore Green.

In addition the latest scheme now introduces lines of refuse and recyclables collection points adjacent to the ramped entrance. These are likely to remain long-term refuse storage points as the houses are too far away uphill for the owners to keep their bins outside their homes. This would be unattractive and also encourage fly tipping.

There is a pedestrian pathway in front of this providing access to the housing. Between the path and the boundary there is a very narrow strip of land intended for new planting and screening behind boundary railings. Railings that we have not been given any details of other than their height. In practice such planting would be impractical if allowed to exceed a height of 1.5m or so. Access would become obstructed. This would therefore not provide adequate screening to the parking or the rubbish bins.

In this latest application in place of a pair of flats is a chalet style house, positioned exactly where a beautiful 150 year old horse chestnut tree originally was, which was ruthlessly chopped down last year. The chalet bungalow has a roof height nearly twice the height of the building itself, and consequently looks top heavy and bulky. The awkward sitting of this house to the front left corner of the site would still appear incongruous and bear no relationship to

the three single-storey shop properties fronting Widmore Road. The row of shops tapers to a point and does not impact adversely on Widmore Green to any great significance. The proposed house does.

Although the house is 50cm further back than the flats were, this is too close to the frontage with the Green. It would also be out of scale and character with the adjacent single storey commercial properties.

Overall I think this proposal should be refused on the following grounds: that it is a cramped overdevelopment of the site and not in line with special standards in the area. That it is out of character with the surrounding homes as there are no terraced homes in Plaistow Lane, despite what the last Inspector said according to our officer's report. That the chalet bungalow is incongruously placed, bears no relationship to the single storey strip of shops nearby, is too near the front of the green and of a bulky design. That the whole scheme is inappropriate, and that a car park and rows of rubbish bins is an unsightly backdrop for Widmore Green and consequently detrimental to the amenity of the residents in the area. Additionally there is insufficient room planned for adequate screening. And also that the development would erode established special standards in the vicinity which would lead to pressure for similar inappropriate cramped redevelopment. And lastly, replacing the front garden with a car park and flank walls of houses is a gross example of garden grabbing contrary to the London Plan.

In conclusion Bickley has lost a lot of its green space – with housing being built in back gardens and filling in gaps between houses with even more houses. The Bickley residents that have chosen to live in this area deserve our support to maintain the high standards of their surroundings. It would be a travesty for this much loved historical area of Bickley and entrance to our borough's capital if this application was approved.

(Policies H7, H8, BE1, London Plan).