

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 10 September 2015

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Charles Joel (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Douglas Auld, Katy Boughey, Ian Dunn,
Terence Nathan, Angela Page and Sarah Phillips

10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Robert Evans and Councillor Sarah Phillips attended as his alternate.

Apologies for absence were also received Councillors Nicky Dykes and Alan Collins.

11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Alexa Michael and Katy Boughey declared a Personal Interest in Item 4.6 as they were members of the Bromley and Chislehurst Conservative Association which was the neighbouring property.

12 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 16 JULY 2015

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2015 be confirmed.

13 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

13.1 CHISLEHURST CONSERVATION AREA

(15/00998/FULL6) - 13 The Glebe, Chislehurst BR7 5PX

Description of application – Part one/two storey side/rear extension, glass balustrade to rear balcony, addition of roof canopy to rear, conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and elevational alterations.

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 the application BE DEFERRED**, without prejudice to any

future consideration, to seek a reduction to the two storey side/rear extension.

**13.2
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(15/01398/FULL1) - Mega House, Crest View Drive, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1BY

Description of application – Erection of roof extension over part of building to provide B1(a) office accommodation.

THIS REPORT WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE CHIEF PLANNER.

**13.3
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL
CONSERVATION AREA**

(15/01485/FULL3) - 9 Station Square, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1LY

Description of application – Part demolition and re-building of first floor and conversion of first and second floor flat into 1 two bedroom and 1 one bedroom flats; part two/three storey rear extension comprising extension to ground floor retail unit with 2 two bedroom flats on first and second floors, including rear balconies.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. Ward Member, Councillor Douglas Auld, objected to the application and a copy of his statement is attached as **Appendix 1** to these Minutes.

It was reported that amended plans had been received too late to be considered as part of the application.

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 with two further reasons to read:-

1. The proposal by reason of its size and the number of units would constitute an overdevelopment of the site out of character with the locality, harmful to the character and appearance of the Station Square Conservation Area and contrary to Policy H7, BE11 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.
2. The proposed development would not provide sufficient onsite parking which would lead to on street parking pressure harmful to the character and amenities of the area and contrary to Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**13.4
CRAY VALLEY WEST**

(15/01766/FULL6) - 68 St Paul's Wood Hill, Orpington BR5 2SU

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

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.

**13.5
BICKLEY**

(15/01953/FULL1) 104 Nightingale Lane, Bromley BR1 2SE

Description of application – Retention of detached two storey 4 bedroom house with revision to dwelling to remove upper section of roof and reduce ridge height by 1.1metre.

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

During the debate the Chief Planner's representative measured the plans from Application 11/00697/FULL6 in response to a statement made by the speaker in support of the application. He confirmed that the measurements set out on page 41 of the Chief Planner's report in line 5, second paragraph under the heading, 'Conclusions', were correct with the exception of the width of the building from the 2011 planning permission, which was 15.4 metres wide and not 14.5 metres as stated. In particular the height of the approved building was confirmed to be 8.6 metres from the approved 2011 plans.

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.

Following the resolution the Applicant approached the Chief Planner's representative but left the room after being advised by the Chairman that this was not appropriate.

**13.6
CHISLEHURST**

(15/02784/FULL1) - 1 - 3 White Horse Hill, Chislehurst, BR7 6DG

Description of application – Erection of 4 three-bedroom houses at Land at rear of this former Lounge Public House.

It was reported that two late objections to the application had been received one being from The Chislehurst Society.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED**, without prejudice to any future consideration, to reduce the units from four to three, to seek Environmental Health (Housing) comments and to clarify if the application complies with standard of living requirements as set out in the London Plan, specifically with regard to fixed shut windows to habitable rooms.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

13.7 CHISLEHURST

(15/02772/FULL1) - Hollybank, Manor Park Road, Chislehurst BR7 5PY

Description of application - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a detached two storey five bedroom house with accommodation in the roof, to include elevational alterations. Part retrospective application.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that a late objection to the application had been received from The Chislehurst Society and also a late observation.

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 three further conditions to read:-

3. Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, drawings showing the gable on the western elevation finished in timber and render shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within one month of the date of this decision. The changes to this gable shall be implemented within four months of the approval of the details, and retained as such thereafter..

Reason: In order to comply with Policies BE1 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the appearance of the building and the visual amenities of the area.

4. Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied all windows at first floor level and above in the eastern flank elevation shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy level 3 and shall be non-opening below 1.7meters above finished internal floor level and shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.

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

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (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 2005 Order (as amended), shall be erected 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 BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan and to prevent overdevelopment of the site.

**13.8
SHORTLANDS**

(15/02804/FULL6) - 6 Pickhurst Park, Bromley, BR2 0UF

Description of application – Single storey side and rear extension.

Oral representations in objection to 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.

**13.9
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK**

(15/03031/PLUD) - 17 Faversham Road, Beckenham, BR3 3PN

Description of application – Single storey rear extension, roof alterations incorporating rear dormer and front rooflights. **CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.**

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that a CERTIFICATE OF LAWFULNESS FOR A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT be GRANTED** as recommended, for the reason set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

The Meeting ended at 8.12 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

Comments of Cllr Douglas Auld to Plans Sub-Committee 1
On 10th September 2015, Concerning 9, Station Square,
BR5 1LY Application No. 15/01485/FULL3

Madam Chairman

Station Square itself is at the centre of the Station Square, Petts Wood Conservation Area.

Members will have noted the content of the proposal to this application shown towards the bottom of page 23, and on page 27 the planning officer's recommendation that the application be refused on the ground of :-

'The proposals would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking of neighbouring residential properties in Petts Wood Road from rear windows and balconies within the rear extension, which would be seriously detrimental to the amenities of these residents and contrary to policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Subsequent to that recommendation I believe all members of the committee have received a letter with attachments from the applicant explaining the steps taken to overcome the ground for objection. The applicant then asks consideration be given to approving the application.

If that had been the only ground for objection then I believe there would have been two possible options. 1. Refuse the application or 2. Defer a decision, as to date the committee have not had the benefit of the further considerations of the planning officer following the receipt of the applicants letter.

However I believe there are other grounds for refusal. The report states that no parking is proposed for the development but adds rather loosely that there would appear to be space for 2 or 3 vehicles at the rear of the extension accessed from the rear service road. The Highways Engineer's officer re-iterates that and adds rather lamely that it would be preferable for some parking to be made available. That officer in agreeing with the submitted survey adds that it is indicated that the majority of the on-street parking demand during the day is likely to be non-residential, and that nearby roads (Petts Wood Road and West Way) have free parking.

I have been a Ward councillor in the Ward for nine years and have an excellent local knowledge of local parking demands and difficulties.

On that basis I disagree with the comments made by the Highways Engineer's officer. For the last five/six years the local councillors, council officers, shop keepers and residents have worked together to achieve a balance regarding parking taking into account the needs of residents, shop keepers and commuters. This has involved at least two public surveys and a great number of fine tuning amendments to the final scheme. If parking was difficult before it became stretched to the limit with the opening of a branch of Sainsbury's and a number of quality restaurants in Station Square in the last two or three years. Without parking being available these businesses and the surrounding shops would not thrive. There is a constant and increasing demand for more and more parking space.

Most of Station Square is metered and heavily parked. Turning right out of the service road at the rear of 9, Station Square, Petts Wood Road is single and double yellow lined for a minimum of 500 hundred yards. The exception to this is the provision of fourteen free parking bays in Petts Wood Road fairly near Station Square. However these are for a maximum of two hours with no return and are intended to encourage a turnover of shop customers. West Way which was also mentioned is fully parked day and night..

When it is cold wet and windy who would want to park 500yards away and walk home when it may be possible to park next to home not withstanding this would cause more obstruction..

It is suggested that there may be space for 2 or 3 vehicles off the service road to the rear of the extension at 9, Station Road. I know this service road particularly well having dealt with a few matters relating to it in the last three years. Some days it is possible to drive nearly the whole length of it but on other days it is impossible. I would emphasize it is a service road serving restaurants and shops on that side of Station Square. To suggest there would be additional parking available at this location is a myth.

Moving on to my final point. As stated above the application site is in a Conservation Area. It is to convert one flat into two and to build two additional flats in a new extension to the rear. Thus it is proposed, without going upwards to build the maximum possible number of flats, four, in a very tight and restricted area. The proposed flat 1, at 54sq.m is 11% less than the minimum size suggested by the London Plan. The proposal states the communal amenity space would be located on the flat roof between the main building and the extension. The dimensions are

not given and from the orientation of the two buildings mentioned the amenity space would only receive minimum sun and natural light for a brief period each day.

While I believe it would be possible to have a maximum of two flats at this location the current application would result in an over development of the site and would result in a cramped appearance.

I propose that the application be refused for the following reasons :-

Lack of Parking
Over development of the site
Overlooking and Loss of Privacy

Policy T3
Policy BE1
Policy BE1

Thank you Madam Chairman



Douglas Auld
Cllr. Petts Wood & Knoll Ward

This page is left intentionally blank