

## PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 8 January 2015

### Present:

Councillor Richard Scoates (Chairman)  
Councillor Peter Dean (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Nicky Dykes, Simon Fawthrop,  
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Russell Mellor, Melanie Stevens  
and Michael Turner

### Also Present:

Councillors Douglas Auld, Alan Collins, Ian Dunn and Stephen Wells

## 24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

No apologies for absence were received.

## 25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were reported.

## 26 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 6 NOVEMBER 2014

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2014 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## 27 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

### SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

#### 27.1 WEST WICKHAM

**(14/03876/FULL6) - 40 Stambourne Way, West Wickham**

Description of application - Part one/two storey rear extension, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and to provide habitable accommodation in roofspace.

It was reported that the application had been amended by the submission of a revised existing plan. Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED** without prejudice to any future consideration, to seek to resolve breach of side space policy.

**27.2**  
**KELSEY AND EDEN PARK**

**(14/04290/FULL1) - Harris Academy Beckenham,  
Manor Way, Beckenham**

Description of application - Erection of 2 temporary buildings to provide primary school accommodation for 60 pupils plus staff until September 2016, together with associated hardstanding and landscaping works and 7 additional car parking spaces.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from the Portfolio Holder for Education, Councillor Stephen Wells in support of the application were also received at the meeting.

The first sentence under the heading 'Impact on the designated Urban Open Space (UOS) and trees' (page 11) was amended to read:- 'Policy G8 of the UDP permits built development on Urban Open Space where it is related to the existing use, is small scale or supports the outdoor recreational uses or children's play facilities on site or any replacement buildings do not exceed the site coverage of existing development on the site.'

It was reported that the map on page 19 of the report did not accurately reflect the current site plan. Correspondence from the Mayor of London and the Bromley Council Executive Director Education Care and Health Services in support of the application had been received. A further five letters in support and 41 letters in objection to the application had also been received.

In regard to the current appeal for the previously refused application, the Chief Planner informed Members that the Inspector was due to visit the site during the week beginning 12 January 2015 and the target date for completion of the Inspector's decision was estimated to be before early March 2015 .

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED** without prejudice to any future consideration, to await the outcome of the pending appeal.

**SECTION 3**

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

**27.3  
CLOCK HOUSE**

**(14/03341/FULL1) - LEB Depot, Churchfields Road, Beckenham**

Description of application - Standby electricity generating plant.

Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Ian Dunn in support of the application were received at the meeting.

One further letter in support and one in objection to the application had been submitted.

It was reported that no objections to the application had been received from the Environment Agency. Members were advised that should the application be granted, an informative concerning vehicle drop-off times should be added and condition 3 should be amended.

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Allen submitted comments in support of the application (see Appendix 1 attached).

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED** without prejudice to any future consideration, for the applicant to clarify hours of operation and provide more information in respect of air quality effects arising from operation of the plant. The applicant should also make a commitment to monitor noise levels after operation and supply data to the Council; this should be controlled by condition. Members emphasised the importance of providing an enhanced cycle route through the site and this should be discussed further with the applicant and secured by way of a Section 106 condition. It was strongly suggested that the applicant/agent attends the next meeting in order for queries to be addressed.

**27.4  
COOPERS COPE  
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(14/03384/FULL1) - 83 Copers Cope Road, Beckenham**

Description of application - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 8 five bedroom houses with associated works relating to a private road, parking 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 together with comments from Network Rail.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED** without prejudice to any future consideration, to reduce the density of the proposal and increase garden space.

**27.5  
FARNBOROUGH AND  
CROFTON**

**(14/04163/FULL6) - 54 Lansdowne Avenue,  
Orpington**

Description of application - Part one/two storey side, single storey rear and first floor front extensions.

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

**27.6  
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(14/04401/FULL6) - 29 Rolleston Avenue, Petts  
Wood**

Description of application - Single storey rear extension and roof alterations comprising gable end/rear dormer extension and front roof lights.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Douglas Auld in objection to the application were also received (see Appendix 2 attached).

It was reported that further objections to the application had been received.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with the addition of a further two conditions to read:-  
5 Construction works may not be carried out other than between the hours of 0900 hrs-1730 hrs Mondays-Fridays unless approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of protecting residential amenity during the construction works.

6 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no building, structure or alteration permitted by Class A, B, C, or E of Part 1 of Schedule

2 of the 1995 Order (as amended), shall be erected or made within the curtilage(s) of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted 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 prevent an overdevelopment of the site.

**27.7  
BROMLEY COMMON AND  
KESTON**

**(14/02872/FULL1) - 32 Mons Way, Bromley**

Description of application - Two storey detached house.

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

**28  
PLAISTOW AND  
SUNDRIDGE**

**(14/03102/FULL1) - Parish School, 79 London Lane, Bromley**

Description of application - Demolition of 4 classroom buildings and erection of detached single storey building comprising 12 classrooms, toilet block, group room, entrance lobby and associated landscaping to provide accommodation to expand to a 3 form entry. Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

It was reported that correspondence from the Director of Education in support of the application had been received.

No objections were received from the Tree Officer. Members having considered the report and objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with the addition of a further condition to read:-

11 If any trees are felled in order to implement the development hereby permitted, trees of a size and species to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be planted as replacements in such positions as shall be agreed by the Authority in the first planting season following completion of the development. Any trees 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 similar size and species to those originally planted.

*Plans Sub-Committee No. 4*  
*8 January 2015*

Reason: In order to comply with Policy NE8 of the Unitary Development Plan and to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development.

The meeting ended at 8.55 pm

Chairman

### **Item 4.3 – (14/03341/FULL1) – London Electricity Board Depot, Churchfields Road, Beckenham**

#### **Comments from Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Vanessa Allen**

##### Comments/questions/conditions

1. I do have concerns about noise. It is difficult to know what 35dB sounds like. I note that the background noise measurements were taken on a Friday in August which would be considered a quiet time due to holidays etc. However the Churchfields Road waste depot does emit noise from time to time during the working day, intermittently and randomly, and I asked the planning office for information on what these noise levels may be. The information was not available.

There are houses around the proposed plant. I will declare an interest as a resident of Clock House Road, but not in the specific area of concern. The nearest houses in Clock House Road are approximately 40m away and a number were written to as part of the notification process. Other houses in Churchfields Road, Clement Road, Seward Road etc are slightly more distant and were not written to.

A number of factors affect the noise issue. The noise impact assessment report covers the subject in some depth but we should also note the following points:

- The plant is more likely to be operating on a winter evening when people have their windows shut.
- I would ask for a condition stating that further noise monitoring will take place when the plant is running and that if noise levels exceed those specified, then more attenuation will be added.
- The agent provided information to the planning officer concerning noise levels and stated that the proposed level is lower than a standard industrial level. But this is not a standard industrial area, it is a normal London residential area with houses, school, open spaces, railway and refuse depot.
- I ask the committee to consider a limit on times of operation. Comments from the EHO support this and a curfew at 11pm seems reasonable, so can this be a condition?

2. Air quality during the construction period seems to be covered by condition 6 but I would also like to see an ongoing compliance condition covering air quality during operation. This will help to ensure the plant is well maintained so that emissions do not get worse over time, with the option for the Council to request further monitoring by UKPR if complaints or problems arise.

3. I would like to see conditions on construction traffic, specifically around school start and finish times, say for one hour in the morning and at least one hour in the afternoon.

I would further request that during construction, as well as the dust management plan, there are obligations for wheel washing when necessary.

4. Finally, I fully support the request for the Waterlink Way cycle route link and ask the Committee to ensure this is a condition of permission, and is covered by an appropriate legal agreement, to cover provision and ongoing maintenance and access.

In conclusion, subject to agreement of the points above, I am happy to accept the planning officer's recommendation that permission to be granted for this development.



### Item 4.6 – (14/04401/FULL6) – 29 Rolleston Avenue, Petts Wood

#### Comments from Ward Member Councillor Douglas Auld

You have already heard from Mr Caple of the objections to this application from local residents. These residents include those who live at numbers 27 and 31 Rolleston Avenue on either side of the application's property. It will become apparent that I will also be opposing this application.

The proposal is to construct a 3.5m deep single storey rear extension, along with roof extensions comprising a partly hipped side gable extension, two rear dormers, front roof lights and a first floor flank window. It is the roof aspect in particular to which I will be objecting.

This roof extension will effectively convert the current semi-detached bungalow into a two storey dwelling and, as accepted by the planning officer, would affect the symmetrical appearance of this pair of semi-detached bungalows. Surely these are undesirable changes. This would undoubtedly set a precedent in this avenue of houses which have largely remained unaltered since they were built probably fifty years ago or more.

Members you have read the officer's report. I would like to comment on a few matters contained in it:-

1. Under the heading 'Location' the last line states 'the road as a whole contains a mix of housing types'. It does not! The road in fact consists of fifty-six semi-detached bungalows interspersed with a smaller number of semi-detached houses. Nos. 2-18 and 1-35 are a slightly older design of semi-detached bungalows and houses of compatible and similar design, while nos. 20-80 and 37-87 are the same types of dwellings but of a slightly more recent design. There are a number of single storey side garages and two or three single storey side extensions. There are no two storey extensions in the whole length of Rolleston Avenue, this is especially relevant to the bungalows. Certainly none of the bungalows have an extension anything like that proposed.
2. Under the heading 'Planning History' you will have noted that an earlier application for a similar rear extension but with slightly larger roof extensions was withdrawn prior to determination. The withdrawal followed a meeting between the applicant and the planning officer. The revised application now has a partly hipped side gable facing no. 27. This is a marginal reduction to the withdrawn scheme.
3. Under 'Conclusions', the officer states that the proposals are not considered to significantly unbalance the pair. I totally disagree. If built this extension as viewed from the street scene would stick out like a sore thumb.
4. Mention is made of the proposed first floor flank window having obscure glazing. As an addition to that condition, should this application be successful, I would ask that the window should be permanently fixed shut.

For the reasons mentioned above, I believe this proposal if permitted would be detrimental to the character of Rolleston avenue.

Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan states that all development proposals, including extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to be of a high standard of design and layout. To those ends, proposals will be expected to meet ALL of the following criteria. These criteria include:-

- 1) Development should be imaginative and attractive to look at, should complement the scale, form, layout and materials of adjacent buildings and areas. (The result of this application would not be attractive to look at, eg symmetry and would not complement the scale, form, layout of adjacent buildings and the immediate area).
- 2) Development should not detract from the existing street scene and/or landscape and should respect important views, skylines, landmarks or landmark features. (This development would be detrimental to the existing street scene.)
- 3) The development should respect the amenity of occupiers of neighbouring buildings and those of future occupants and ensure their environments are not harmed by noise and disturbance or by inadequate daylight, sunlight or privacy or by overshadowing. (This development would result in a loss of privacy to the occupants of the houses on either side by overlooking from the two proposed rear dormer windows and loss of natural light to the rear rooms, to the conservatory of one and to the patios of both these properties in the afternoon and evening.)

Policy H8 states the design and layouts of proposals for the alteration or enlargement to residential properties will be required to satisfy ALL of the following criteria:-

- 1) The scale, form and material of construction should respect or complement those of the host dwelling and be compatible with developments in the surrounding area. In this instance the development is not in the scale of the host building and not in the scale or form of developments in the surrounding area).

In conclusion this proposed extension is an over development and is out of scale with the host building and the houses in the immediate vicinity. As such it would be out of character in this location.

Further if built it would result in loss of amenity, in particular to the occupiers of the adjoining houses by reasons of loss of privacy/overlooking and loss of light and to other residents in the vicinity by reason of the appearance of this house in the street scene if the extension were to be built.

Members I ask that you refuse this application on the grounds of Policies BE1 and H8 as mentioned above.