

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 25 September 2014

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Charles Joel (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Douglas Auld, Teresa Ball, Nicholas Bennett J.P.,
Katy Boughey, Lydia Buttinger, Ian Dunn and Terence Nathan

Also Present:

Councillors Peter Dean and Peter Fortune

13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Ellie Harmer; Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP attended as substitute.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Alan Collins.

14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

15 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 31 JULY 2014

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 31 July 2014 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

16 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 1

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

16.1 HAYES AND CONEY HALL

(14/01873/FULL1) - Isard House, Glebe House Drive, Hayes

Description of application - Demolition of existing care home and erection of 21 dwellings to provide 2 x one bedroom flats, 10 x two bedroom flats, 6 x three bedroom houses and 3 x four bedroom houses with a total of 36 car parking spaces, provision for refuse/recycling and cycle parking and associated landscaping.

Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Peter Fortune were received at the meeting. Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED** without prejudice to any future consideration, to seek alterations to the scheme in order to provide sufficient side space as required by Policy H9, to increase the level of parking provision and to enter into discussions concerning the proposed development with local residents.

16.2
BROMLEY TOWN

(14/02066/FULL1) - 7 Hayes Lane, Hayes

Description of application - 2.59m high (max) fencing and gates to either side of No 7 and 9 Hayes Lane to provide footpath for access to playing field beyond.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the condition set out in the report of the Chief Planner with the addition of a further 3 conditions to read:-

2 The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years, beginning with the date of this decision notice.

Reason: Section 91, Town and Country Planning Act 1990

3 The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the building shall be as set out in the planning application forms and/or drawings unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

4 The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in complete accordance with the plans approved under this planning permission unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

**16.3
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(14/02204/ADV) - Land fronting 95-113 High Street,
Chislehurst**

Description of application - 8 non-illuminated lamp column banner signs and one cross-street non-illuminated banner sign. **RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION.**

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that A SPLIT DECISION BE MADE as follows:-**

- 1) **ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT BE GRANTED** for 8 non-illuminated lamp column banner signs as recommended, subject to the condition in the report of the Chief Planner; and
- 2) **ADVERTISEMENT CONSENT BE REFUSED** for cross-street non-illuminated banner sign as recommended, for the reason set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**16.4
CRAY VALLEY WEST**

**(14/02313/MATAMD) - Riverside School, Main
Road, St Pauls Cray**

Description of application - Minor Material Amendment to application ref. 13/01744 - Erection of part 3m/part 1-2m boundary fence and 1.2m gate. Erection of 1.2m internal fence with light fittings. Relocation of existing 3m gates.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that the MINOR MATERIAL AMENDMENT BE APPROVED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**16.5
PENGE AND CATOR**

(14/02875/ADV) - 46 Green Lane, Penge

Description of application - Internally illuminated fascia sign.

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

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

**16.6
BICKLEY**

(14/00706/FULL6) - 14 Mavelstone Close, Bromley

Description of application amended to read - 'Increase of roof ridge incorporating front and rear dormers, extension to existing front porch and conversion of existing garage into habitable room.'

Oral representations in objection to the application were received.

Comments from Ward Member Councillor Colin Smith were reported at the meeting.

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 condition to read:-

4 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 in the interests of the visual amenities and character of the area and to prevent an overdevelopment of the site.

**16.7
CHISLEHURST**

(14/01312/FULL3) - The Lounge, 1-3 White Horse Hill, Chislehurst

Description of application - Three storey side and rear extension, second floor extension and alteration and enlargement of existing roof incorporating side and rear dormers and conversion of first and second floors from office and residential use to eight flats (comprising six 2-bedroom and two 1-bedroom units).

THIS REPORT WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE APPLICANT.

**16.8
CHELSFIELD AND PRATTS
BOTTOM**

(14/02446/FULL6) - 28 Warren Road, Orpington

Description of application - Addition of first floor to form 2 storey house and part one/two storey rear extension and porch canopy.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. Planning Officer comments on behalf of the Chief Planner were reported.

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 condition to read:-

7 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 in the interests of the visual amenities and character of the area and to prevent an overdevelopment of the site.

**16.9
BROMLEY COMMON AND
KESTON**

(14/02458/VAR) - 137 Hastings Road, Bromley

Description of application - Variation of condition 2 of planning permission ref. 13/01136 (single storey rear extension for use as a separate shop (A1 use class) and installation of associated shop front) to extend hours of operation on Monday to Wednesday 9am to 6pm, Thursday to Friday 9am to 7pm, Saturday 9am to 6pm and Sunday 11am to 4pm at 137 Hastings Road/2A Jackson Road.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. Planning Officer comments on behalf of the Chief Planner were reported. Comments from Ward Member Councillor Stephen Carr requesting a restriction on operating hours were reported. No objections to the application were received from the Highways Division or Environmental Health.

A late submission from the applicant had been received. A further objection to the application had also been received.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the VARIATION OF CONDITION BE APPROVED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with condition 2 amended to read:-

'2 The use shall not operate on any Sunday or Bank Holiday nor before 09:00 or after 18:00 on Monday to Saturday.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the area.'

**16.10
ORPINGTON**

(14/02630/FULL6) - 1 Hillcrest Road, Orpington

Description of application - First floor side extension and bay window to front.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Planning Officer comments on behalf of the Chief Planner were reported.

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

**16.11
ORPINGTON**

(14/02634/FULL6) - 1 Hillcrest Road, Orpington

Description of application - First floor side extension and bay window to front.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

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

**16.12
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

(14/02650/FULL6) - The House on the Wall, Watts Lane, Chislehurst

Description of application - Part one/two storey side and rear extension with new basement and patio at rear, single storey attached annexe with glazed link to

main house and demolition of exiting detached annexe.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informative set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**16.13
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

(14/02661/LBC) - The House on the Wall, Watts Lane, Chislehurst

Description of application - Part one/two storey side and rear extension with new basement and patio area at rear, single storey attached annexe with glazed link to main house LISTED BUILDING CONSENT.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that LISTED BUILDING CONSENT BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the condition set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**16.14
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

(14/03055/FULL6) - Ridgeview, Southill Road, Chislehurst

Description of application - Two storey front and first floor front and part one/two storey front/side/rear extensions to include existing garage and elevational alterations.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. Planning Officer comments on behalf of the Chief Planner were reported. Members were advised that a previous planning appeal for this application had been dismissed.

Attention was drawn to an error on page 85 of the report; the words 'hipped roof' in paragraph 5, line 4 were amended to read '*flat roof*'.

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

1 The proposed first floor rear extension would be over-dominant and would be detrimental to the

amenities that the occupiers of Eldridge might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy by reason of visual impact and loss of light and prospect in view of its size, bulk and depth of rearward projection, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

16.15 BROMLEY COMMON AND KESTON

(14/01745/FULL1) - Ravens Wood School, Oakley Road, Bromley

Description of application - Mezzanine floor for sixth form and library, replacement windows with ventilation louvres and roof ventilation.

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.

16.16 BROMLEY COMMON AND KESTON

(14/01934/RECON) - Ravens Wood School, Oakley Road, Bromley

Description of application - Variation of Condition 1 of permission ref: 12/01755/VAR to allow retention of two mobile buildings for a further two year period.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that the VARIATION TO CONDITION 1 BE APPROVED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

16.17 HAYES AND CONEY HALL

(14/02617/FULL1) - 53 Kechill Gardens, Hayes

Description of application - Erection of attached two storey 3 bedroom dwelling and extensions and alterations to 53 Kechill Gardens.

THIS REPORT WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE CHIEF PLANNER.

16.18 PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL CONSERVATION AREA

(14/02810/FULL6) - 9 The Chenies, Petts Wood

Description of application - Single storey side/rear extension and part conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation with flue at rear and

replacement roof to existing garage and existing rear extension.

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Douglas Auld reported his views together with those of fellow Ward Member Councillor Simon Fawthrop and Mr Eric Nash, Chairman of the Chenies Road Association. The comments are attached as Appendix 1 to these Minutes.

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

1 The proposed development by reason of its size and design, would fail to respect the layout, scale or form of the existing dwelling, would detract from the streetscene and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of The Chenies Conservation Area, contrary to policies BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance for The Chenies Petts Wood Conservation Area.

2 The proposed development would, by reason of the emission of smoke from the wood burner flue, result in a harmful impact upon the amenities that neighbouring residents can reasonably be expected to enjoy, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**16.19
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

(14/02977/FULL1) - 11 Alexander Close, Hayes

Description of application - Conversion of existing dwelling to one 3 bedroom and one 2 bedroom dwelling (Revision to planning permission allowed on appeal reference 13/04292 to include single storey rear extension).

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.

**16.20
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK**

(14/02988/FULL6) - 5 Croydon Road, Beckenham

Description of application - Formation of vehicular access and additional hard standing to front.

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

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

**16.21
PLAISTOW AND
SUNDRIDGE**

(14/02998/FULL6) - Treesway, Lodge Road, Bromley

Description of application - 2.1m high (max) front boundary wall, piers, railings, gates and 2.6m high rear boundary fence. RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION.

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

**16.22
FARNBOROUGH AND
CROFTON
CONSERVATION AREA**

(14/03218/FULL1) - Public Conveniences adjacent to 20 Church Road, Farnborough

Description of application - Demolition of public convenience building and erection of a detached two storey 3 bedroom dwelling with vehicular access and off-street parking.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner with condition 7 amended to read:-
'7 No windows or doors additional to those shown on the permitted drawing(s) shall at any time be inserted in the flank elevation(s) of the dwelling hereby permitted, without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.'

SECTION 4

(Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

**16.23
CRAY VALLEY EAST
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(14/01350/ADV) - Land at Junction with High Street
Blacksmiths Lane, Orpington**

Description of application - 12 non-illuminated lamppost banner signs on Blacksmiths Lane and High Street, St Mary Cray.

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

**16.24
CRAY VALLEY EAST
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(14/01372/ADV) - Land rear of 1-8 Market Meadow,
Mill Brook Road, Orpington**

Description of application - 5 non-illuminated lamppost banner signs on Mill Brook Road and High Street, St Mary Cray.

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

The meeting ended at 8.55 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

ITEM 4.18 - 9 THE CHENIES, PETTS WOOD

COMMENTS FROM COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS AULD, PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL WARD

You will already have either heard or read the comments of my Ward colleague, Councillor Simon Fawthrop and of the Chairman of The Chenies Road Association , Mr Eric Nash. I will try not to repeat too many of the points which they've already made but it is unavoidable I shall have to touch on some.

This application is in a Conservation Area for which an Article 4 Direction is already in being to preserve the appearance of the frontages. It is for a single storey side/rear extension and part conversion of existing garage to habitable accommodation with flue at rear and replacement roof to existing garage and existing rear extension. The officer's report recommends approval. With the support of both Councillor Fawthrop mentioned above and the third Ward Councillor, Tony Owen I will be opposing the officer's recommendation and proposing at the conclusion of my comments that the application be refused.

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas has raised objections to the proposal and the Panel's comments are shown under Comments from Consultees near the top of page 104 of the officer's report. In brief they state that existing garages in conservation areas should be retained as an essential part of the designated character. In answer to this at the top of page 105, line 5, the officer merely states 'Whilst the concerns raised by APCA are noted....'.

The Chenies in Petts Wood **IS** the Conservation Area. The road consists of just twenty-nine large and distinctive houses which remain virtually unaltered since they were built about eighty years ago. It is arguably one of the most attractive roads in the whole Borough. Although there are a number of variations in the architecture of the dwellings, there is a style and a balance which is common to all. Twenty-eight of the twenty-nine houses have either an integral garage or an original 1930s small detached garage to the side, some of which are set back into the garden. In appearance, having been built at the same time as the houses, these garages are very much in accord with the host dwellings and are a part of the street scene.

In turning to this application, I would first of all agree with Councillor Fawthrop that the proposed rear extension in isolation is acceptable in that it would not be visible from the road and would not result in loss of amenity to neighbours. However the proposed side extension and alteration or indeed possible removal of the small detached garage to the side would have negative effects on the Conservation Area in general and on the dwelling at no.9 itself. In respect of this part of the application, Councillor Fawthrop posed the question 'would the proposal enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area?' I believe it would do neither and in fact would detract from the street scene. Bear in mind there are no similar extensions in the whole road.

Were this application to success, it would set a precedent which others in the future may follow and this eventually could result in a diminishing of the attractiveness of this Conservation Area.

The flue or chimney at the rear of the existing garage to serve a wood burning stove is a further worrying element. Obviously wood smoke would emit from it and should the wind be blowing in the wrong direction, this would result in a loss of amenity to neighbour(s). Again, there are no similar flues in existence in the road.

I have visited the venue, read fully the officer's report and the comments made by Mr Nash and Councillor Fawthrop. If we can't protect our conservation areas what can we protect? I believe the application should be refused and so propose, giving as grounds for refusal:-

Contrary to:

BE1 (v) - loss of amenity, disturbance through possible smoke emissions.

BE11 (i) - would not respect the layout, scale and form of existing buildings.

(ii) - does not respect and incorporate in the design features that contribute to the character and appearance of the area.

Thank you Madam Chairman

Douglas Auld
Councillor Petts Wood & Knoll Ward

COMMENTS FROM COUNCILLOR SIMON FAWTHROP, PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL WARD

I'm sorry I can't be present at the meeting due to another commitment. However, I'd be most grateful if the Committee would take these observations into account.

For anyone that has not visited The Chenies, I would urge them to do so prior to the meeting. On a visit you will see that this Conservation Area is probably in the top five Areas within the Borough. The Area is not just a classic 1930s suburban development, as described in the UDP, but of such quality that when considering the frontages and street scene it is very hard to improve upon the design, outlook and general character of the area. This road is a Conservation Area in its own right and not just as part of a wider scheme as often happens. This small road has been singled as being of an exceptionally high standard.

When looking at the application before you, the main policy considerations that need to be taken into account are policies BE1, BE11, BE12 and H8. When considering BE11 the policy is as follows:-

'In order to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas, a proposal for new development, alteration or extension to a building within a conservation area WILL be expected to:-

- (i) respect or complement the layout, scale, form and materials of existing buildings and spaces.
- (ii) respect and incorporate in the design existing landscape or other features that contribute to the character, appearance and historic value of the area; and
- (iii) ensure that the level of activity.....'

This application is for a single storey side/rear extension and conversion of the existing garage to a habitable room. In terms of the rear extension, this on balance, would appear to be acceptable as it is not visible from the street scene and would be neutral in terms of this very important conservation area. However, when it comes to the side extension, this stretch of the conservation area is characterised by detached garages which stand out as part of the design of the buildings in the Conservation Area. The application in respect of this element of the proposal falls woefully short of enhancing or preserving the appearance of the conservation area. Throughout the report before you, there is not one sentence that identifies that this application either enhances or preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Clearly Members will be aware that it does not preserve the conservation area as it is making a change and therefore the question that Members need to address is: does it enhance the conservation area? My view is that it does not because the detracting of the rhythm of housing in the street scene is broken by this proposal and furthermore, the proposed flue goes against the Article 4 Direction which was to preserve the appearance of the frontages. This will be visible from the street scene and will be detrimental to the whole conservation area and cannot be said to enhance the conservation area. There are no other such flues anywhere in the conservation area.

The final point I would make is that the submission from APCA (The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas) should be given due weight and taken very seriously in your deliberations as it is unusual a) for APCA to respond and b) to raise objections. This underlines the importance of the Chenies Conservation Area not only to the locality but to the Borough as a whole.

I would therefore urge Members to refuse this application or at the very least defer the application to remove the side extension and keep the garage as an integral part of the conservation area.

COMMENTS FROM MR ERIC NASH, CHAIRMAN OF THE CHENIES ROAD ASSOCIATION

Very regretfully I will be unable to attend on Thursday when I understand the Committee will be considering this application. My son's graduation ceremony is taking place on the same day in Peterborough.

I understand that the planning department have already recommended approval for this application to the Committee to discuss. Unfortunately, I cannot agree to this recommendation and without sounding rude or disrespectful, have the planning department representatives visited the Chenies before arriving at their decision? The existing detached garage with gable end visible to the road will certainly not look or resemble anything like the original if allowed to proceed; in actual fact, I can only describe it as looking like a Swiss chalet roof and looking totally unbalanced and out of character. The other point that I wish to mention is that within the comments made regarding the flue, in that planning only seem to have considered its proximity not as being a feature of the street scene. My concerns are that this chimney will only be 2 metres from the rear of my ground level living accommodation and with the proposed lowering of the roof pitch, I still feel the prevailing west/south westerly winds we have, the discharge from this flue will play a prominent feature in our lives. Can the flue not be installed in such a way so that the outlet is on the opposite rear corners of the rear garage that would place it approximately 4 metres away.

We in The Chenies are proud to be residents in this beautiful road which the Chenies Road Association maintain to the highest possible standards and are pleased that we are part of the conservation area which we hope is there to protect areas like The Chenies and similar. The current trend within the Chenies at the current time is that as and when a property comes onto the market for sale, it would appear to be the younger generation that are buying but do not appear to have interest or concerns about conservation, they simply seem intent upon modernisation and alterations. If this front garage elevation extension is approved, it will in my opinion then leave the door wide open for future planning applications which would then possibly look to modify the situation even further, challenging the question of conservation and at that stage what would we have left to conserve?

I sincerely hope the Committee give this application a fair and sympathetic consideration.

Regards
Eric Nash

This page is left intentionally blank